A. B. ON RED-BAITING AND THE PROGRESSIVES

The COMMUNIST

AUGUST

MEETING REACTION'S ASSAULT ON THE UNEMPLOYED

By HERBERT BENJAMIN

THE COMMUNIST PARTY IN THE ELECTIONS

IN ILLINOIS
By JACK MARTIN

IN THE NORTHWEST
By MORRIS RAPPORT

PALESTINE
By M. WELNER

TWENTY CENTS

NOTES ON LATIN AMERICAN HISTORY *by* SAMUEL PUTNAM

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Aug. 1939

New Books

READY IN AUGUST

Theory of THE AGRARIAN QUESTION

By V. I. LENIN

Volume XII of the Selected Works. **$2.00**

THE THEORETICAL PRINCIPLES OF MARXISM

By V. I. LENIN

Volume XI of the Selected Works, 763 pages. **$2.00**

A HANDBOOK OF FREEDOM

An anthology of the democratic tradition in English history from the time of Alfred the Great to the present. **$2.00**

WHAT IS PHILOSOPHY?

A Marxist Introduction

By HOWARD SELSAM

Revised edition of a popular seller **$1.25**

•

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Station D, New York, N. Y.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

VOL. XVIII, No. 8 AUGUST, 1939

The COMMUNIST

A MAGAZINE OF THE THEORY AND PRACTICE OF MARXISM-LENINISM
PUBLISHED MONTHLY BY THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE U.S.A.
EDITORS: EARL BROWDER, ALEX BITTELMAN, V. J. JEROME

CONTENTS

Review of the Month	A. B.	675
Meeting Reaction's Assault on the Unemployed	HERBERT BENJAMIN	689
Secondary Aspects of Mass Organization	WILLIAM Z. FOSTER	701
Legislative Problems in Illinois	JACK MARTIN	712
After the Liquidated Balfour Declaration in Palestine	M. WELNER	721
The Communist Party in the State of Washington and the 1940 Elections	MORRIS RAPPORT	730
Monetary Reform and the Democratic Front	LESLIE MORRIS	740
Notes on Latin American History	SAMUEL PUTNAM	748
From the World Communist Press		759
Book Reviews		
Moses and Monotheism, by Freud	MORRIS COLMAN	764
Toward an Understanding of the U.S.S.R., by Florinsky	SETH LARSON	767

Entered as second class matter November 2, 1927, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Send checks, money orders and correspondence to THE COMMUNIST, *P. O. Box 148, Sta. D (50 E. 13th St.), New York. Subscription rates: $2.00 a year; $1.00 for six months; foreign and Canada $2.50 a year. Single copies 20 cents.*
PRINTED IN U.S.A. 309

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

AN INDISPENSABLE BOOK

FIGHTING FOR PEACE

By EARL BROWDER

254 pages, price $.50

The fight for a positive peace policy which would penalize the aggressor and aid the victim of aggression, and which would collaborate with all other peace forces to halt the fascist war incendiaries, is today the central issue confronting the American people. The whole national security of the United States revolves around this issue.

In **Fighting for Peace,** Earl Browder develops, in brilliant style, a rounded-out program on the question of peace. His analysis of the alignment of forces on a world scale, the motives and interests, the position of the United States in relation to the Rome-Berlin-Tokio Axis, to the other so-called democratic powers, to the Soviet Union, and the national policy which he outlines for this country, provides an invaluable instrument for the further rallying of America's peace forces.

●

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Station D, New York City

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

REVIEW OF THE MONTH

Congressman Voorhis Is Afraid of the United Front. Did We Have Too Much or Too Little? Real Reasons for Waverings of Middle Classes. California Teaches Important Lesson. Meet Adequately Needs of Masses and Consolidate Progressive Coalition. What Are the Waldmans Driving At? America's Youth Congress Meets a Reactionary Conspiracy. Strengthens Its Unity and Prestige. Should Beware of Further Divisive Attacks. An Important Problem for Non-Communist Progressives. Failure to Differentiate Between Communism and Fascism Betrays American Democracy. Ideology and Politics. Stalin on "Communist" Dictatorship. What Does Collaboration With Communists Involve? Political Clarity and Honesty of Convictions. President Roosevelt Could Initiate a National Discussion. Moods and Problems of the People.

IT CAN be laid down almost as a natural law that whenever pro-fascist reaction is about to launch some new attack on the liberties of the people and on the unity of the democratic forces, the cry is raised of a "Communist menace." The wonder is—or maybe it isn't—that certain people who consider themselves progressive and anti-fascist still manage to fall for this trick.

Representative Voorhis of California may have thought that he was being very original when he gave utterance at Camp Tamiment to the following:

> ". . . the greatest danger to our democracy as the most likely vehicle for totalitarianism is the united front idea." (*New York Times,* June 25.)

But this is not original at all, as every well-informed person should know. Fascism and pro-fascist reaction have always sought, and are doing so today, to keep the democratic forces of the people disunited and at loggerheads. Whether internally or externally, fascism advances not because of its superior strength but because of the lack of unity in the camp of the anti-fascists. This has been proven so often in the course of the last decade that there can be no more room for uncertainty on this score. Yet Congressman Voorhis finds it possible to tell the people, at this day and hour, that the danger to our democracy comes not from pro-fascist reaction, not from the insufficient unity of its opponents, but—from "the united front idea."

One is tempted to ask the question: who educated whom on the Dies Committee? Voorhis—Dies or Dies—Voorhis?

Our Congressman from California thinks he has good reasons for his

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

beliefs. The reasons are that unity of the democratic forces will compel the unification of the reactionary forces. He said:

". . . the very presence in the country of organizations of the Left which include supporters of the Communist International will inevitably lead to the formation of organizations to the Right composed not simply of fascists and Nazis but of a large number of conservatives who would have nothing to do with them were they not convinced—right or wrong—that the Left had set no outer limits for the policies it would tolerate or even pursue." *(Ibid.)*

This whole thing may sound very plausible to some but is altogether artificial and arbitrary. It falls to pieces at the first touch of objective examination. For example: What "Left" is it that would set "no outer limits" to the policies of a united labor and democratic front? Not the Communist Party; and we challenge anybody to prove the contrary. Where and when has the Communist Party failed to live up to the common and recognized political obligations of any movement or action of a united or democratic front nature?

It is worth noting that Representative Voorhis did not make that charge himself. Presumably, he had no facts. But he did say that "a large number of conservatives" think so—"right or wrong." Well, well—this is not serious. For one thing, who are these conservatives? And what do you mean by a conservative? Nobody in this country wants to be known as a reactionary, let alone a fascist. In fact, very few of the leading pro-fascist reactionaries want to be known even as conservatives. On the contrary, pretty nearly all of them want to be known as progressive-minded, but sensibly and conservatively so. Say conservative-progressives, or conservative-liberals. This is the garb in which the Hoovers and Garners are trying to parade. Are these the people who think so—"right or wrong"? Undoubtedly. But then these are also the very people who are leading the reactionary and pro-fascist offensive in the country and are doing so, not because Communists participate in united front movements, but because finance and monopoly capital needs and wants this kind of an offensive against the people and against democracy. Moreover, whatever successes this offensive has been able to achieve, this resulted not from too much united front but from too little.

Of course, there are undoubtedly large numbers of people in this country who, because of lack of information but especially because of an excess of *mis*-information, tend to view suspiciously the participation of Communists in common actions of the democratic forces of the nation. Because of such attitudes and feelings, reaction does succeed in catching into its nets some of these elements, which are found in certain middle class circles and also among certain sections of farmers. To overlook it would be just as bad as to misinterpret it. Does that present a problem to the progressive and anti-fascist camp? Absolutely. But it is not going to be solved in the interests of this nation's democracy by weakening or giving up the idea and practice of a united and democratic front. No. This way surely lies the victory of pro-fascist reaction —victory in 1940—and the eventual coming of fascism.

Genuine and thoughtful progres-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sives cannot and—we hope—will not choose this way. On the contrary, they will give serious thought and political effort to finding a democratic and anti-fascist way of solving this as well as other problems. And in doing so, they will find that behind the uneasiness and suspicions of certain middle class and farmer circles with Communist participation in the democratic front process there lies not only deliberate misinformation spread by the reactionaries (see last summer's performance of the Dies Committee) but, even more important, a genuine feeling of grievance with the *inadequacies of achievement* of the progressive camp. Is that true? Absolutely so. Large numbers of small and middle farmers, suffering continuously from the crisis and the reactionary offensive, justly feel that not enough has been done by the progressive camp to help them, even though appreciating the little that has been done. Naturally, they are dissatisfied; naturally, they are looking for an explanation and a way out. And the agents of monopoly reaction are pretty quick to come forward with an answer. We know what that is. The trouble, they say, is with the progressive-New Deal camp and with the Administration. How? Very simple. The Administration favors the wage earners as against the farmers. It is radical, socialistic, and is honeycombed with Communists. It is "a united front" and that is the trouble. The solution? Kick out the New Deal, break up this "united front" and put into office an administration of "sound" and "conservative" progressivism. And what is that? The Republican Party, naturally.

Now, examine the *mechanics* of this reactionary incitation. It begins with an attack on the "radicalism" of progressive measures. Congressman Voorhis should know this from his own legislative experiences. It brands such measures as "class" legislation, political spending and "regimentation." At the same time, reaction opens up an intense fire upon all approaches which lead to united action between labor and farmers, between liberals and labor, between any of them and the Communists. Let Congressman Voorhis examine objectively the experiences of the 1938 elections in his own state of California and he will see how true this is.

What happens then? To the extent that this attack succeeds, the progressive, anti-reactionary camp fails to achieve sufficient *unity* and *strength* to carry through its original measure, whether intended to benefit directly the farmers, the workers or the city middle classes. Contrariwise, reaction feels strong enough either to bury that measure altogether or so to emasculate its provisions as to make it totally inadequate. When this is accomplished, reaction proceeds to the next step. It exploits the inadequacies of the measure for the purpose of turning the legitimate grievances of the masses with these inadequacies against the progressive-New Deal camp and against the Administration. And again it brings forward the old tale of the radicalism, socialism and Communist "infiltration" of the New Deal-progressive "united front." The circle is complete and reaction has scored another victory. This has happened, for example, on the issue of old-age pensions.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Fortunately, there are also other experiences. We refer to those (California in 1938) where the progressive-New Deal camp simply refused to be terrorized by the pro-fascist attack on the "united front idea"; where labor, the toiling farmers and city middle classes have tried to pull together against the common reactionary enemy (with serious weaknesses in many spots); and where, consequently, the progressive-New Deal coalition scored significant victories in the state elections.

It is true that many difficulties have arisen for this coalition since the 1938 elections. But what is their source? Insufficient unity. Failure to proceed from the election victories to a *more* consolidated and united coalition of all anti-reactionary and anti-fascist forces. Hence, insufficient power and strength to overcome the attacks and sabotage of the reactionaries. Hence, insufficient progress in meeting the needs and grievances of the masses of which the fresh surge of the "Ham and Eggs" pension movement is a sure indicator. Hence, new openings for reactionaries and fascists to demoralize the progressive camp.

In other words, the trouble in California today is not too much "united front" but too little. And it is gratifying to note that the anti-fascist forces in that state realize the conditions and are tackling the problem in a true democratic front manner. And what is this manner? First, *try to meet the legitimate needs and grievances of the masses,* and do it in the only way possible—by curbing the power of the reactionary monopolies and big business and by making them pay. There is no other way. Second, *try to strengthen and solidify the progressive-New Deal coalition,* making it strong enough not only to promise but to do things and to check the reactionary offensive. In doing so remember that the slightest opening given to reactionary attacks on so-called Communist "infiltrations" and "united fronts" will be used to prevent the democratic unity of the people, to disperse the progressive movements, to undermine the nation's democracy. It will be used—is being used—to secure a reactionary victory in 1940.

When this democratic front policy is adhered to, *these two things,* honestly and consistently, and wherever this is already being done even inadequately, then and there the mistrusts and suspicions of the misinformed toward collaboration with Communists will and do quickly evaporate. This is an undeniable fact. Moreover, then and there appreciation develops among the masses and their progressive leaders of the loyalty, competence and positive value of Communist collaboration. In fact, an understanding already matures of the indispensability of progressives collaborating with Communists.

And it stands to reason that it should be so—we repeat—where the progressive camp is sufficiently united and strong to fight effectively for adequate help to the masses. Where farmers and middle class people see a progressive coalition, *including Communists,* energetically and effectively at work, voicing honestly and fully the needs of the masses and bringing results, there the soil will be barren for anti-progressive, anti-labor and anti-Communist incitements by pro-fascist

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

agents of reaction. There the people will not listen, let alone be influenced by such incitements. There, on the contrary, a feeling will soon begin to grow that Communist participation in the common work may have something to do with its success and effectiveness. And that will be only the truth. A truth which, in the present world situation, will undoubtedly hurt reaction and fascism, but which is of great help to the camp of progress and democracy, to the American people and nation.

Waldman and his friends, at whose Camp Tamiment affair Congressman Voorhis voiced the above attack on the "united front ideas," are old hands at disrupting labor and progressive unity of action. So brazen have their splitting activities become of late that the American Labor Party leadership found itself compelled to denounce publicly Waldman and his collaborators of the so-called Social-Democratic Federation. He was denounced as a disrupter and as a collaborator of reactionary politicians in the old major parties. He exposed himself as one who is working against the New Deal-progressive forces in New York and also nationally. Is it possible that Representative Voorhis does not know that?

Assuming that he doesn't (let us be charitable), does he know at least that his attack on the "united front idea" is in substance a rehash of the stuff with which the Waldmans of Germany have paved the way for Hitler's rise to power? He should know that; it is very important.

Hitler came to power because there was no united and democratic front to stop him. And there was no such front because the Waldmans there, the reactionary leaders of Social-Democracy holding the majority of the working class in their grip, did not want it. And how did they justify this opposition before their followers? Well, here is what they used to say: "The greatest danger to the Weimar Republic comes from the Communists." "The united front is a menace to democracy and socialism." "If you make a united front with the Communists, you will frighten the bourgeoisie and the liberals into the arms of the fascists." "A united front will draw upon you all the thunder and lightning of reaction." "Beware of the united front."

Isn't this what Mr. Voorhis said at Camp Tamiment?

What happened to Germany thanks to this stuff, everybody knows. The absence of a united and democratic front did *not* prevent the German monopolies and their fascist agents from building up *their* front. On the contrary, just because the working class continued disunited and thus ineffective as an opponent of fascism and reaction, the middle classes and the liberals had no solid force to rally to. Under the terrific pressure of demoralization, terror and demagogy, they began to succumb to fascism and to capitulate to it. The rest is known.

Is it not obvious that the reactionary and fascist front is *helped,* not hindered, by the absence of labor and democratic unity? Is it not obvious that the surest way to fascism is the lack of a united and democratic front? Or does Representative Voorhis want to repeat the German experience?

These questions have to be placed before the people and their progres-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sive leaders plainly and directly. The reason for doing so is also obvious. It is the fight for a progressive-New Deal victory in 1940. He who honestly wants this victory, must want and fight for a united and democratic front of *all forces* loyally striving to bring about this result. Any other way threatens defeat and disaster. This has to be explained, argued for, emphasized and re-emphasized because pro-fascist reaction is making *its main line* of attack the prevention of such a united and democratic front.

* * *

THE Fifth American Youth Congress, held in New York City the first week in July, demonstrated afresh the tremendous importance and vitality of this organization for the youth of America and for the welfare of the people as a whole. Perhaps the most admirable characteristic of the Congress is that it is so genuinely a youth movement, a movement of young people, while at the same time linking itself up, so consciously and maturely, with the nation's great progressive trends and struggles.

It is quite evident that the American Youth Congress is growing in numbers, in influence and also in internal cohesion. It has already become a great force for progress and democracy. And it was perhaps for this reason that certain reactionary circles have paid so much attention to its fifth congress.

Evidently reaction is disturbed. It refuses to make peace with the fact that large sections of America's youth, organized in the Congress, are energetically at work building a wide progressive highway for the nation's youth. This is clearly no good for reaction and fascism. An American youth conscious of its own mission in the preservation and extension of democracy and peace, seeking friendly collaboration with labor and with the dominant progressive trends in the country, such an American youth offers little encouragement to pro-fascist reaction. No wonder therefore that the agents of reaction are disturbed. No wonder also that they have concentrated so much effort on the fifth congress to introduce division and to bring about splits in the organization.

In this they have failed. Despite all the maneuvers of the reactionaries, the Congress not only remained united but, in the course of the struggle, even consolidated its unity. It is stronger now than it was before. Its prestige in the country stands higher. It is really in a position now *to broaden out* its activities among wider sections of youth, especially to bring the Catholic youth into collaboration with and participation in the Congress.

Yet it is necessary to examine in some detail the nature of the reactionary maneuvers to split the organization. For it is certain that such maneuvers will be repeated, and with greater concentration of effort, as we come closer to the national elections in 1940.

Noteworthy in the reactionary efforts to divide the Congress are particularly two things. First, the engineers of this attempt, the real moving forces behind it, preferred to remain in hiding, manipulating the affair through a handful of little known and inconsequential people. Second, the so-called "issue" to bring about

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

division was the old and tried one—Communism.

As to the first feature, the legitimate question is who was it really that staged this splitting attempt? All signs point to the fact that the reactionary hierarchy of the Catholic Church had a good deal to do with it, either directly or indirectly. And it is safe to assume that some influential Republicans and anti-Roosevelt Democrats had a hand in it too. It is safe to assume further that, had this attempt been more successful, these hidden forces behind it would have already made their open appearance.

What do these people want of the American Youth Congress? The reactionary hierarchy of the Catholic Church simply fears it. The Congress, one must remember, is developing a tremendous appealing force to America's youth, including the Catholic youth and their organizations. Liberal and progressive-minded Catholics wouldn't be disturbed by it a bit. On the contrary, they would welcome the participation of the Catholic youth in such an important progressive movement as the American Youth Congress, even on the narrow grounds of building protection for Catholics against fascism and reaction, but also on the broader grounds of strengthening the country's democracy. But not so the pro-fascist members of the hierarchy. These are simply afraid to let the Catholic youth mingle freely and in a democratic manner with the non-Catholic progressive youth of the country. And there is no doubt that among Catholic youth organizations there is a strong tendency to collaborate with and participate in the American Youth Congress.

In a desire to stop and confuse this tendency, the pro-fascist members of the hierarchy have apparently undertaken to raise again the Communist "issue," hoping in this fashion either to divide the Congress and break it or to so discredit it in the eyes of the Catholic youth that the tendency for joining will be definitely stopped. These people are not likely to be satisfied with the outcome of the Congress. The dividing business, as already indicated, failed completely. As to the "discrediting" part, that too did not seem to work out so very well.

Consequently, the Congress has now a real opportunity to approach successfully the Catholic youth organizations and to win them for common activities.

On the question of Communism as an "issue" in the Congress, there are several things to be said. The first one is that it was *not* a real issue but was dragged in artificially by the straw men of reaction for ulterior purposes. Why should it be an issue in the American Youth Congress? Have Communists ever tried to commit the Congress to the principles of Communism? No, never. The Young Communist League, some of whose members are also members of the Communist Party, participates in the Congress on the same basis as all other organizations. It is there to help build the Congress and to promote the creed, policies and program of the Congress. It is clear that, with such a relationship, the question of Communism cannot become an "issue." Unless, that is, one seeks to expel the Young Communist League from the Congress, using this as a *wedge* for breaking up the organization as a

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

whole. And this was exactly what the reactionaries sought to precipitate. But then this raises, and did raise, an entirely different issue. It is the issue of *unity*. Shall there or shall there not be an American Youth Congress striving to embrace the *majority* of America's youth on a creed of democracy, progress and peace? This was the issue raised by the reactionaries and not the principles of Communism. The reactionaries are naturally against such a Congress.

Yes, say the reactionaries, but how can the Young Communist League be permitted in an organization committed to democracy and against dictatorship? The presumption is that the Young Communist League is against democracy and in favor of dictatorship, a presumption that is wholly the creation of reactionary slander and distortion. The Young Communist League (Y.C.L.) is a progressive educational organization striving to bring up its membership to an understanding and acceptance of the teachings of Marxism-Leninism. Because of this —not in spite of it—the Y.C.L. is committed by its constitution and policies to work for the preservation and extension of democracy. Moreover, the Y.C.L. has already proven *in deeds,* first of all in this country, but also in Spain, that it not only knows how to talk about democracy but also how to fight for it, and that it is willing to give everything for it. What better proof does one need? Isn't this the main reason why reactionaries and fascists do not want to see Communists in general democratic movements?

Yes, the reactionaries press on, but you are seeking to establish in this country a Communist dictatorship? Nonsense and distortion, we say; and so did, in substance, say Gilbert Green at the American Youth Congress. It is positively ridiculous to see a pro-fascist reactionary "charge" a Communist with being opposed to democracy. In what camp in this country are the reactionary members of the Catholic hierarchy? Everybody knows they are in the camp of the *enemies* of American democracy, giving aid and comfort to the fascist priest Coughlin. And whom did these same people support in the Spanish struggle? Franco and fascism. But where are the Communists found? In the camp of democracy, here and everywhere—first, last and always.

Our "accusers" know, of course, very well that there is no such thing as a "Communist dictatorship," neither in theory nor in life. In fact, they invented that conception and term themselves, and they are using it to mislead and divide their progressive opponents.

As far back as January, 1926, our teacher, Stalin, had occasion to blast this conception when it came from enemes of Bolshevism inside the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. He said then ("Problems of Leninism") that what we believe in is the rule of the *working class* in alliance with all toiling classes and groups, under the leadership of the working class, as the only form of state power which can achieve the transition from capitalism to socialism; that this brings into life a new and higher type of democracy—socialist democracy; that it is the culminating point of a process of struggle in the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

capitalist countries against reaction, for democracy, for more democracy; that this is what the scientific Marxian term "proletarian dictatorship" stands for; that this means the democratic rule of the overwhelming majority of the people, leading eventually to the complete *moral unity* of the nation; and that the role of the Communist Party in a socialist democracy, which is continually becoming more democratic, is one of *leadership,* of guidance, a role that the party wins in the course of decades of struggle for democracy and the well-being of the people, *a role made possible by the recognition and will of the people themselves.*

To reject and condemn "Communist dictatorship," as Stalin did in 1926, means therefore condemning an *invention* of reactionaries and enemies of Communism.

Of course, under specific concrete conditions, this may mean something else too. There is no doubt that the majority of the delegates to the Fifth American Youth Congress, in voting for the resolution opposing dictatorship "whether Communist, fascist, Nazi, etc.," wanted to reaffirm the well-known fact that they are not Communists, even though the form it took exposes the Congress to certain dangers. Others in this majority may also have wanted to indicate their opposition to the principles of Communism although, again, the form it took is somewhat confusing. Because the very idea of lumping Communism with fascism is fundamentally wrong and is liable to play into the hands of the enemies of democracy and, hence, of the enemies of the Congress. And in general: if under great pressure and terrorization from pro-fascist circles, a non-Communist or an opponent of Communism feels that he has to make known that fact publicly, *for the sake of clarity of political position,* no one in the democratic camp can take exception to it. On the contrary, clarity of political position is desirable to the utmost. It is a weapon of democracy and progress against reaction and fascism, both of which thrive on political unclarity, confusion and fake issues. And as far as we are concerned, we say: the more political clarity and honesty the better.

But it must be real clarity. And if this is agreed to, how much political clarity does one really introduce by saying "I am equally against fascism and Communism"? To our way of thinking, he is making confusion worse confounded. He is disorienting the people. He is showing them two enemies where there is in reality only one—fascism. He thus weakens and dissipates the force of their struggle against fascism when *concentration of effort* is the mandate of the historical turn in the life of our nation and of the world. He is giving pro-fascist reaction *a handle* with which to sow disunity and division in the camp of democracy. And we fear that at least a little opening, if not a handle, has been given to reaction in certain *phrasings* of the Congress resolution which lumps Communism and fascism together. The Congress will do well to be alert and on guard against any efforts of reaction (which will be made) to widen that opening.

Certainly, one ought to be able to say exactly what one thinks on public issues and political alignments. A pro-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

gressive, a democrat, an opponent of reaction and fascism, a believer in American democracy, who is not a Communist or who is in principle opposed to Communism, is in imminent danger of betraying his own position if he does not *differentiate* between fascism and Communism. Differentiate, mind you, not for the purpose of expressing preference for Communism as against fascism. Not at all. But for the purposes of *objective truth* and in order to remain loyal to and consistent with one's own *democratic* convictions and principles. These democratic convictions and principles, as embodied in the Declaration of Independence and in the Bill of Rights, demand a struggle against reaction and fascism, because these are the enemies of democracy and—today—they are the enemies of America. No true democrat can therefore afford to waver or be confused for any length of time on the plain truth that the enemies are fascism and reaction. He cannot afford it without betraying his own position.

What about Communism, we are asked? In our own theory and ideology, we are firmly convinced that the anti-fascist struggle for democracy today opens a broad highway to the socialist democracy of tomorrow. That is why we are such consistent and devoted and dependable fighters for democracy *today*. But whatever non-Communist democrats or anti-Communist democrats may think of our philosophy and ultimate political aims, or whatever they may say about them (we always like to discuss these ideological questions where such discussions are in order and desired), they cannot afford to forget for one moment that Communists are the irreconcilable enemies of fascism, that they are today fighting most consistently for democracy and that their collaboration is vitally necessary for the success of this historic fight.

These are proven truths, not guesses or mere theories. Therefore, we ask again: why should it be difficult for non-Communist and anti-Communist democrats, while fully clarifying their ideological position on Communism (the real one, not the inventions), to concentrate their political attack against their enemy—reaction and fascism? Why should such democrats, in their legitimate desire to express opinions on Communism and to differentiate their position from it, why should they be doing it in a way that gives aid and comfort to the *politics* and political struggle of pro-fascist reaction? And this is exactly what they do when they lump Communism together with fascism, not in theoretical and ideological discussions, not in lecture forums (which is bad enough), but in *political resolutions* and in the course of *political struggles*. There the first mandate for all democrats and anti-fascists is to do nothing that may weaken the concentrated and united effort against reaction and to do everything to bring about such a concentrated and united effort.

In brief: no genuine believer in American democracy can for long maintain the position of fighting "equally" fascism and Communism without betraying democracy and eventually capitulating to fascism.

Ever so often, a non-Communist progressive does manage to say the right thing to reactionary attacks, in

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

full consistency with his general philosophy and point of view. Then it is that we hear some sensible and politically effective speech. It runs something like this. "Of course, I am not a Communist; and he who says I am is a liar. But I am an enemy of reaction and fascism, a fighter for democracy, and am ready to collaborate with all who wish to carry on this fight, regardless of their own ultimate aims and philosophies." Some have gone a step further and added: "That's why I favor the unity of all democratic forces to fight to a finish the attacks on American democracy by the reactionaries and fascists."

In fact, this is the idea upon which the American Youth Congress is founded. In almost all of its decisions, the fifth congress reaffirmed and reinforced this idea which should enable this organization to bring into its midst wider circles of youth, especially the Catholic youth. But the opening for possible division forced into the Congress by the reactionaries on the "issue" of Communism is there. It cannot be overlooked. Wisdom and forethought dictate constant vigilance against this possibility becoming a reality.

* * *

If it is true that President Roosevelt is planning another trip across the country this summer, it is to be hoped that the plans materialize. Whatever objectives he may have in mind himself—and those, presumably, would be very important—it would seem that the time is here for the masses of the people to hear again directly from the President on the state of the nation and its problems.

When President Roosevelt speaks, the nation listens. It not only listens but also thinks more intensively than usual, thinks more collectively on what is to be done for the welfare of the masses, for the national and social security of the people. And there are lots of things requiring such thought today.

Should the President make such a trip, he will do well to take the masses of the people fully into his confidence. By this we mean that he should discuss with them not only achievements but also difficulties, shortcomings, problems and plans. He should discuss things in a way that will encourage them to come forward and express their grievances, feelings, and also their *ideas* on how matters could be improved, how governmental policies could be made more effective, more democratic, of greater benefit to the security and well-being of the masses.

It seems to us that the masses of the people are now in a mood for precisely such a national discussion. Not only because a national election is in the offing. This naturally has a good deal to do with it. But mainly because the time is ripe for the *summing up of experiences* and for the drawing of some important *conclusions*. It is almost ten years since the crash in 1929. During this decade, the people had the sad experience with the Hoover policies and, in contrast to them, the new and different policies that have been developed by the New Deal. Great political fights have taken place. Classes, groups and parties have demonstrated their true positions and attitudes. Issues have crystallized into a clarity practically unknown since the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

days of struggle against slavery. And problems, fundamental problems, face the country today with a directness that cannot be mistaken.

It seems to us further that the key to the present mood of the masses, a mood that has been in the making for some time, is some such feeling as this: "we have made headway, no doubt, in beating back some of the attacks of the reactionary monopolies, but their offensive continues, gets even stronger and bodes no good for the masses of the people and for the nation's democracy and peace, especially with advancing fascism abroad. Governmental policies have helped a great deal to alleviate conditions, although unevenly as between various groups, with those needing help most getting it in many cases least. On the farms this is seen most clearly. But also in other places. New Deal declarations of policies and principle have stimulated greatly the confidence of the people that America can tackle in a truly democratic way the people's problems, their needs for social as well as national security. We have come to learn that the mass demands for jobs, security, democracy and peace are not utopias but practical demands to be realized on the road of curbing the powers of big business and developing and extending democracy. But the economic crisis is here. The pro-fascist offensive of reaction is here. The fundamental problems are still here. We must solve them—we can solve them—and we cannot take too much time in trying to do so."

This does not state it fully, of course. The masses also feel that there are certain difficulties. Serious difficulties. The sabotage of big business. These have to be discussed and a way pointed out to overcoming them.

Above all, one must not miss the feeling of *confidence* that prevails among the masses in their ability to overcome the difficulties. Confidence in the ability of America to solve its problems of social and national security in a democratic and popular way. This feeling of confidence is a tremendous asset to the progressive-New Deal camp but it does not work *automatically* in favor of progress. Reaction too seeks to exploit it by dinning into the ears of the people that, since America is so rich and resourceful, the only thing necessary is for the government to leave it alone and the country will pretty quickly be back on its feet. As in the "good old days."

Of course, reaction will not leave the country alone. Given a chance, it will take it to fascism. From which follows that the people's confidence will take a progressive and democratic direction *only if* an effective program —*a democratic front program*—a program of a more successful and more developed democracy is presented to the country in a practical political way. The elements of such a program are here. These rise from the progressive traditions of the people and from their more recent struggles. It is the line of curbing big business and monopoly—for the achievement of recovery, for the provision of jobs and security, for the strengthening and development of our democracy, for checking fascist aggression and fighting effectively for peace.

President Roosevelt could very profitably for the nation discuss with the people the plight of the small farmer and of the middle farmer.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

There is distress among them. Their problems, especially those of the small farmer and sharecropper, have only been scratched on the surface. Maybe the time has come for the Farm Security Administration, which is expected to deal with these problems, to become a major agency, a corner stone in the agricultural set-up of the government.

Equally profitable would be a national discussion of the intensified reactionary and fascist efforts to stir up racial and religious antagonisms in the country. It is no secret that, encouraged by powerful reactionary Wall Street interests, anti-Semitic, anti-Catholic and anti-Negro activities are being spread by Nazis, fascists, Coughlinites, Ku Kluxers, etc. This is serious national business because these activities strike at the very roots of the nation's unity and democracy. Let the people discuss it and find the best ways of overcoming it. It can be done, of this there is no doubt. Symptomatic is the slow rise to expression in Catholic circles of the democratic and progressive elements. The formation in New York of the "Committee of Catholics to Fight Anti-Semitism" is a most gratifying and promising development. Other inter-racial and anti-intolerance movements point in the same direction.

In this national discussion which President Roosevelt could initiate, an important place would be occupied by the problem of how to overcome the opposition to labor unity on the part of such elements on the Executive Council of the A. F. of L. as Hutcheson, Woll and Green. President Lewis of the C.I.O., and the unity supporters in the A. F. of L., membership and leadership, have made their will to unity unmistakably clear, despite all the slander to the contrary spread by the reactionaries in the press. The sole obstacle to unity today are the agents of reactionary big business on the Executive Council of the A. F. of L. A way should be found to overcome this opposition. A people's discussion of the matter would be very helpful.

Perhaps the needs of the small merchant and business man should also be aired in this discussion. The Mead Bill is a good one but not especially for the very small business men. It is not designed to help them. And they must be helped, for economic as well as political reasons.

And, lastly, the question of peace, neutrality and non-intervention. Hoover has at last blossomed out with a full-grown program of *Munichism* adjusted to the special needs of the pro-fascist monopolies of the United States (*New York Times*, July 7). It is the clearest expression of the designs of American reaction in the field of foreign policy that we have yet had. It is in substance a systematized and developed edition of the infamous "non-intervention" that was practiced in Spain. It is the policy—deliberate conspiracy, one should say—of letting fascism spread the war, of letting all other major powers be drawn into it, with the United States looking on in the vain expectation that moral suasion will force the belligerents to carry on the war in a humanitarian way. Regularizing its barbarities, so to speak. And when all the combatants reach the stage of exhaustion, then American pro-fascist reaction (hoping to be in the government by

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that time) will step in and take charge. So the hope runs.

A nice little scheme, heavily flavored with the most disgusting hypocrisy. And it has as much chance of working out the way Hoover expects as the Chamberlain non-intervention had or Munich. That is, fascism would be the gainer, not America. The British and French Munichеers have temporarily defeated the Spanish republic but they have not helped their own countries any. They have made the positions of their own countries more difficult. Hoover's plan could achieve similar results for the United States.

The Hoover scheme of neutrality and non-intervention is, first, a program *for war*. It is a plan of what America should do in a world war. This in itself is significant because it makes not even a pretense at seeking to help to prevent it. Secondly, it favors the fascist powers on the face of it by providing for the export of foodstuffs to all belligerents. Thirdly, it definitely gives the go-sign to Hitler, Mussolini and Japan. And fourthly, despite its verbiage to the contrary, it lays the basis for eventual American capitulation to the aggressors.

A national discussion of the kind projected, and which is really already in the air, would go a long way toward preparing the people for the serious struggles ahead.

A. B.

ERRATUM

A misplaced line of type destroyed the sense of a sentence in last month's "Review of the Month." The second sentence at the top of the second column on page 579 should read:

The destruction of the people's achievements under the New Deal by the method of "overhauling," which *is apparently conceived as a more or* less gradual and painless process. . . .

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MEETING REACTION'S ASSAULT ON THE UNEMPLOYED

BY HERBERT BENJAMIN

FOUR major engagements in a period of six months. Four hard-fought battles to save the New Deal works program from a reactionary wrecking crew. Six months of continuous fighting which has made the unemployment field the most active front in the far-flung war between the forces of reaction and the people's forces. This is the record of the first half of 1939 and of the first session of the 76th Congress.

Of course, the fight did not begin with the opening of Congress in January. The unemployment field has been an active field of struggle for nearly ten years now. There have been few pauses of very long duration. The position of the unemployed has been at all times since 1929 a precarious one. No other group of the population has suffered so much from the crisis of capitalistic economy and none has been subjected to so many and such vicious attacks.

But the past six month have nevertheless established a new record for the number and magnitude of the struggles on this field. Four separate major legislative battles were waged in the Congress and in the country over the issue of appropriations for unemployment relief through a Federal works program. And each time there was involved in the outcome of the struggle not only the amount and kind of relief to be provided, but the broader and more fundamental issue of the kind of government under which the American people shall live; of the role that government shall play in the attempt to meet the social and economic problems of the people.

POLITICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF THE FIGHT AROUND THE WORKS PROGRAM

More immediately, the struggle around the unemployment relief issue was waged with a realization on the part of both sides in the conflict that the outcome would exert what might be decisive influence in the crucial 1940 elections.

These considerations influenced the character and were responsible for the number of major battles that have been raging without interruption since the opening of the 76th Congress. These considerations, in fact, governed the strategy of the reactionaries in the 1938 Congressional elections.

First, the reactionaries are aware of the fact that the unemployed are as a group the most consistent supporters of the New Deal. Various unofficial polls have demonstrated that from 80 to 90 per cent of the unemployed

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

favor the New Deal and stand behind President Roosevelt. With ten to twelve million unemployed extending their influence into millions of families in every Congressional district and community of the country, it becomes a matter of major political importance to reaction that the unemployed shall be thrown into confusion, separated from other sections of the population, discredited, and if possible antagonized against the New Deal and the labor and progressive movement generally.

Second, the continued presence of ten to twelve million unemployed, which is a manifestation of the fundamental crisis of capitalism, is demagogically represented by the reactionaries as evidence of the failure of the New Deal, and of all the liberal social measures that have been fostered under the New Deal in the effort to afford some relief to the victims of the capitalist crisis. Though opposing even the mildest reforms, the reactionaries do not hesitate to make demagogic promises to a people weary of prolonged large-scale unemployment.

It is an essential part of the strategy of reaction to exploit the continued unemployment as an indictment, not of the monopoly capitalism which produces it, but of the progressive forces who sponsor and support measures designed to reduce unemployment and alleviate the suffering it causes.

The success achieved by the reactionaries who used this strategy in the 1938 Congressional elections emboldened all of them. Strengthened by these electoral victories, they were enabled to proceed to vigorous and extensive application of their strategy. It was as part of this strategy in the preparation for the 1940 elections that they chose to make it necessary to wage four legislative battles within six months around the unemployment relief issue. Even their professed determination to reduce government spending was a secondary consideration, and in this case as insincere as their professed indignation because after six years the New Deal could give nothing better than a W.P.A. job at a minimum security wage to several million of the unemployed.

When President Roosevelt requested the Congress to authorize an $875,000,000 deficiency appropriation for W.P.A. the tory coalition in Congress slashed this appropriation to $725,000,000. In making this slash the Garnercrats and Hooverites made no attempt to argue that any great change would be effected in the Federal budget by this relatively small amount. They even agreed, under pressure of an aroused mass movement, that the President could come back for more in a few weeks, if it were found necessary. But they stubbornly refused to vote for the amount that Roosevelt asked.

That is why the fight around the first deficiency appropriation had to be followed with a second fight immediately afterward for the additional $150,000,000. This meant that the relief issue had to be taken to the people and another mobilization conducted within a few weeks after the hard fight over the $875,000,000 request was concluded.

In the second fight, the "economy bloc" slashed $50,000,000 off the amount requested by the President.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But though the amount "saved" was even more insignificant in relation not only to the total national budget but even to the total of relief expenditures, the Garner-Republican bloc was well satisfied. For its main immediate interest was to make political capital in line with its basic strategy, rather than to save any substantial amount of Federal funds.

AIM OF STRATEGY OF THE REACTIONARIES

Concretely, the strategy of the reactionaries is aimed at the following: First, to support the sit-down strike of big business. This is accomplished in this case by creating "lack of confidence," by dramatizing the continuing depression, by focusing attention on the continued unemployment and creating apprehension on the part of those small business men who depend on government stimulation of mass purchasing power. Second, to discredit the New Deal Administration and its supporters as treasury-raiders who keep coming to Congress with demands for huge appropriations that never solve any problems and who would ruin the country if it were not for such watchdogs of the Treasury as Garner, Glass, Vandenberg, Taft in the Senate and Woodrum, Taber and other "conservatives" in the House.

Naturally, this strategy is designed to prove that Roosevelt has lost influence in the Congress on the grounds that he, as well as the entire New Deal program, have been repudiated by the people in the 1938 elections. Furthermore, every debate around the relief issue affords additional opportunity to discredit, through slander and by exaggeration of the most minute weaknesses, the W.P.A. and the principle of Federal relief through a works program.

Another and by no means unimportant purpose of this strategy is to exhaust and demoralize the W.P.A. workers and the unemployed and especially their organization — the Workers Alliance. Even the most powerful kind of a union would find it difficult to stand the strain of three or four nation-wide lock-outs or strikes, involving all its membership, in a period of six months. While the comparison may not be exact, it is nevertheless true that the type of campaign that the Workers Alliance is compelled to conduct in connection with each fight around a W.P.A. appropriation is in many ways as hard as and in some ways harder than, a strike involving hundreds of thousands of workers in every part of the country.

The reactionaries in Congress are well aware of this. They are aware also of the fact that many of the unorganized unemployed and W.P.A. workers and even some of those who are organized are growing weary of the seemingly endless struggle to get or to keep a job from which they derive scant satisfaction and even more scanty income. As a matter of fact, some of the W.P.A. workers, especially in some of the more industrial and progressive cities, would be able to get as much and even more in direct relief without working than they can earn on a W.P.A. job. It is a tribute to their moral quality that these workers prefer to work, even though this means more expense for transportation, clothes, etc., rather than to accept a dole.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Nevertheless, some of the unemployed can be influenced by the demagogic suggestions that they would be better off if W.P.A. were abolished and private enterprise were encouraged by an end to government "spending." This was shown in the 1938 elections. And though it would seem inconceivable, it is nevertheless true that of the millions of unemployed there are some who believe the reactionaries when they argue that they are voting to cut W.P.A. appropriations and even to impose harsh restrictions upon W.P.A. workers, in order to foster opportunity for decent jobs at better wages in private industry.

Their own actions, the tricks to which they were forced to resort in order to push their program through Congress, provide the best proof that the strategy of the reactionaries failed to win popular support for their policies and program. On the contrary, in each instance the people as a whole and not only the unemployed, were roused to more vigorous and determined defense of the New Deal in general and of the works program in particular. In the House this fear of the people's wrath was expressed by a parliamentary maneuver which prevented a record vote.

This is why the Senate was forced in the first deficiency fight, in January, to agree that there would be no reduction in the W.P.A. rolls during the winter months. They had to agree also practically to invite the President to come back with a request for a further appropriation to restore the amount which they had cut from his original request for $875,000,000. Even then the reduced appropriation was passed by a majority of only one vote.

In the second deficiency fight, the $50,000,000 cut was made possible only because of a last-minute deal entered into by Senator Barkley, the majority leader, in the absence of President Roosevelt. This deal was based on a hypocritical plea in behalf of the W.P.A. workers, all of whom would have been thrown off their jobs by a complete shutdown unless money were immediately voted to keep the program going.

But though they could not win mass support, the tactics of the reactionary Garner-Republican coalition in Congress did help them accomplish their legislative purpose. They were able to swing behind them a considerable number of those conservatives who in the past had gravitated toward the New Deal and were known as "coat-tailers." They were able to develop an atmosphere of hysteria against the unemployed, against the works program, and against all who attempted serious and responsible discussion of the program on the basis of merit. In this way, with the help of the press, they succeeded in preventing adequate presentation of the progressive point of view, even though they could not win support for their own policies and program.

THE RED HERRING

In tactics as well as objectives, the reactionaries in Congress are increasingly taking their cue from the Berlin-Rome axis. It is not surprising therefore that their attack upon the unemployed, upon the rights of labor and upon the Administration efforts

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to combat economic depression, was carried through behind a smoke-screen of Red-baiting. This was carefully prepared and engineered by designating the Woodrum sub-committee on appropriations as a special investigating committee, ostensibly to investigate "the Works Progress Administration and the administration of laws, regulations and orders administered by it."

This maneuver served two purposes. First, it provided money and authority for another mud-slinging campaign such as has been conducted by the infamous Dies Committee. Only this time all the attack was to be concentrated upon the works program and in the first place upon the Workers Alliance. Second, by occupying themselves with the so-called investigation, the Garnercrats were able to delay consideration of the President's request for a 1940 appropriation, while pretending to study the manner in which the works program could be improved. This would again give them an excuse for preventing debate and discussion on the program by Congress as a whole.

Despite their desperate efforts, Woodrum, Taber and other Tory Democrats and Republicans were unable to make any impression upon public opinion through their would-be sensational exposure of Communism in the Works Progress Administration and in the Workers Alliance. They opened their public hearings by devoting two full days to cross examining the national officers of the Workers Alliance on their personal political views and affiliations. They were prepared to spring what they expected to be a sensational exposure that the General Secretary-Treasurer of the Workers Alliance is a member of the Communist Party. But their expectations were disappointed when Herbert Benjamin not only readily admitted membership in the Communist Party, but pointed out that this was a matter of general public knowledge, that his record as a leader of the organized unemployment movement since its inception is proof of the constructive role that Communists play in the mass organizations that devote themselves to furthering the interests of the people and the welfare of the country.

Rather than discrediting the works program and the Workers Alliance, the obvious bias and unfairness of the committee and the disreputable character of the witnesses and testimony which it invited and admitted to its hearings served further to discredit this and similar red-baiting investigations and investigating committees.

This became evident to some of the members of the committee itself, as is shown by the following excerpts from the record:

"Mr. Cannon [ranking majority member of the Appropriations Committee, representative from Missouri and House Parliamentarian]: Let me ask you [Mr. Roberts, Counsel for Committee], is there anything in the W.P.A. rules or regulations, or the authority creating it which provides that a man who receives relief and who goes on a project shall belong or not belong to any party, Democratic, Republican, or Socialist, or to any organization, labor, social or otherwise? . . .

"Mr. Woodrum: There are some people who make a distinction between what the Democratic Party and the Republican Party stand for and the Communist Party.

"Mr. Cannon: But the Constitution of the United States provides that no distinction

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

shall be made between any party or because of a man's political or sectarian beliefs." *

An even more pointed expression of disgust with the Nazi technique of red-baiting as a means of advancing reactionary purposes was made by the conservative Senator McCarran of Nevada. Looking directly at the notorious Nazi stooge, Senator Reynolds of North Carolina, Senator McCarran made the following interjection to a typical Reynolds diatribe:

"The Senator from North Carolina cannot brand me, and I do not believe he can brand other members of the Senate, as being in sympathy with Communism because we may vote to feed some hungry people."

And later in the same exchange, Senator McCarran placed the issue even more sharply with the following statement:

"I may say to the able Senator from North Carolina . . . America has nothing to fear from the standpoint of Communism. . . . What we in America have to fear is fear itself produced by someone who forever and always talks about the bugbear of Communism. . . . The trouble is that there are those who forever use the bugbear of Communism to scare someone in order that they themselves may rise up and thus be held up as the champions against the so-called danger of Communism. . . . "

That this is the purpose of the red-baiters and that there is no other basis for the charge that the Workers Alliance is subversive because Communists appear in its leadership, was also recognized by such outstanding Administration spokesmen as W.P.A. Administrator Colonel Harrington, and by such distinguished Americans as the First Lady of the Land, Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt.

Colonel Harrington indicated his disagreement with the slimy methods and his disapproval of the fascist purpose of the so-called Investigating Committee, by flatly declaring that he did not believe that the Workers Alliance is subversive and that, contrary to the inspired story which appeared in the *New York Times,* he would continue to recognize and deal with the officers of the Alliance. In a prepared statement which he presented to the committee at its last session, he devoted about twelve out of thirty-eight pages to a detailed explanation of "Relations of the Works Progress Administration With Labor Organizations and Specifically With the Workers Alliance of America." *

He included and filed copies of correspondence between himself and the officers of the Workers Alliance and summed up his views as follows:

"I cannot avoid feeling that representations that the Workers Alliance is a subversive organization have been considerably exaggerated. I can certainly say that so far as my personal dealings have been concerned, no improper request has been presented to me by that organization. . . . "

And, dealing with the issue of Communist influence among the unemployed, he observed:

"Perhaps the proportion of Communists in the Workers Alliance is relatively high. I do not know. However, if that is the case I do not think it unusual because the Workers Alliance is recruiting its membership from project workers who have taken an economic licking and whose normal tendency would be to align themselves with a political party

* *Official Record.* Hearings Before Sub-Committee of the Comm. of Appropriations, etc. Part 1, page 1127.

* *Ibid.,* pp. 1273-1291.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which promised a Utopia in which everyone would be happy and prosperous."

This attitude was very distasteful to the red-baiters of the Woodrum Committee; they hurriedly adjourned the hearing, without asking the W.P.A. Administrator a single question on the subject on which he is in a position to speak most authoritatively and which they were supposedly studying and investigating.

The crowning rebuke to the red-baiters was given at the recent National Right to Work Congress, when Mrs. Roosevelt appeared and addressed the 1,200 delegates who came in response to the call of the Workers Alliance. Woodrum and his tory associates had pulled every possible wire to induce Mrs. Roosevelt to cancel her engagement to speak at the Congress. Efforts were also made to induce the Secretary of the Interior, Harold Ickes, to cancel the permit for the use of the Labor Department Auditorium.

Had they succeeded, the reactionaries were prepared to use this as substantiation by distinguished liberals that the Workers Alliance was outside the pale and unworthy of respect or consideration because of the charges that had been made against it. Naturally their failure to accomplish this had precisely the opposite effect.

But though the mass movement in defense of the unemployed and of the Works Program was not weakened by the red-scare raised through the Woodrum Committee, it did serve to provide a convenient excuse for those Congressmen who wanted to administer crippling blows against the Works Program, against the unemployed, against the New Deal, and against all progressive labor organizations, especially in this case the Workers Alliance. It served also to provide a pretext for bringing the vital 1940 Relief Bill onto the floor only a few days before the end of the fiscal year.

Thus, it was again possible for the reactionary leadership of the House and Senate to appeal for speedy action, with limited debate, on the ground that otherwise the Works Program would automatically suspend on July 1 and the W.P.A. workers would be left stranded.

THE STRUGGLE AGAINST THE WOODRUM ACT

It is significant and a reflection of the political alertness and activity of the people's organizations, that under such circumstances, 86 votes were nevertheless cast on the floor of the House for the Casey Bill, which was sponsored by the C.I.O., by the Workers Alliance, and by Labor's Non-Partisan League. This vote, the largest number thus far registered for a progressive relief measure offered without the support of the Administration, is all the more important because it called not only for a substitution of legislative provisions framed by the reactionaries, but for an increase of about $750,000,000 over the amount requested by President Roosevelt.

The fact that the Senate completely revised the bill as passed by the House, so that most of the obnoxious provisions of the House bill were eliminated and many additional liberal provisions sought by labor were passed, likewise testifies to the vigor of the supporting movement developed among the people.

It would be a mistake not to recog-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nize this partial victory, even though the 1940 Relief Act as finally passed and signed is even worse than the bill as originally voted out of the House. On the contrary, the very fact that the reactionaries in control of the Congress were forced to resort to such palpable trickery and double dealing in order to circumvent the will of the people is proof that the masses are not as subject to confusion by reaction as they were in the fall of 1938. The record of the tory coalition in Congress, the policy they have pursued and the tactics they employed serve as a timely warning of the dire consequences that would follow from a victory of reaction in 1940. Instead of weakening the labor and liberal forces, instead of creating divisions in the democratic front, the tactics of the reactionaries have stimulated a greater will to fight and with it a greater realization of the need for maximum unity on the part of the people's forces.

This finds expression in the unprecedented nation-wide protest movement, in the spontaneous strikes, stoppages and demonstrations that began in every part of the country, on the very first day that the 1940 Relief Act—the now infamous Woodrum Bill—went into effect. The labor movement has been stirred to its very depths. It is taking up the challenge of the reactionaries and a significant struggle is developing that is bound to have far-reaching effects upon the labor and progressive movement and the 1940 elections. This of course means everything that is involved in the Presidential elections of the coming year.

One of the most striking and significant features of the situation that has arisen because of the vicious character of the 1940 Relief Act is the role of the A. F. of L. membership. It is the A. F. of L. membership and the lower officials who have taken the lead in active resistance to the Woodrum Bill. In doing so, they have embarrassed the reactionaries of the Executive Council of the A. F. of L. and confounded the tory newspaper publishers, editors and columnists.

There are, of course, very good reasons for the prompt and determined response of the A. F. of L. members. The provision of the Woodrum Bill which does away with prevailing hourly wage rates and requires a uniform 130-hour month for all W.P.A. workers was the very first provision to go into effect. Workers reporting on the first working day after the bill was passed were suddenly confronted with an announcement that henceforth they would be required to work 130 hours instead of the number of hours which, multiplied by the amount of the prevailing wage rate, equaled their monthly "security wage." For the skilled building trades workers whose union and prevailing rate was in some cases as high as $2 per hour, this means that instead of working 42 hours for the maximum monthly wage of $84, they will henceforth be required to work nearly three times as many hours without any additional pay.

It would be very strange indeed if such a drastic wage cut were accepted by organized workers. Not only that, it would be disastrous to the wage standards of all building trades workers. But precisely for

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

these reasons the action of the leadership of the A. F. of L. in allowing Congress to vote such a provision into the 1940 Relief Act without offering strenuous opposition was an action against the interests of labor.

At any rate, the subsequent developments are being carefully watched and studied by many opposing forces. The reactionaries are watching with a view to determining whether they had not miscalculated the ability of the A. F. of L. leadership to hold their members in line and deliver their support to an anti-New Deal candidate in 1940. Reactionary newspaper editors are wondering how to treat what they are pleased to call a strike "against the government" when the strike is initiated, not by the Workers Alliance, which they brand as "red," nor even by the C.I.O., which they insinuate is moving toward revolutionary tactics, but by the staid and respectable American Federation of Labor.

Progressives will also do well to watch and study the action of the A. F. of L. members in this situation. They will find in it ample confirmation of the fact that regardless of the policy of the Wolls, Freys and Hutchesons, the rank and file of the A. F. of L. is equally militant, progressive, and desirous of unity with the members of the C.I.O. with the unemployed, with the farmers and other people's forces, for effective struggle against reaction.

The present struggle around the vicious Woodrum Relief Act is, of course, but a foretaste of what is yet to come, unless this act is revised. At the moment when this is being written, it is not yet very generally known that, in addition to the drastic cut in hourly rates, the infamous Woodrum Act also requires that the administration reduce the monthly pay of all W.P.A. workers in the North and West by amounts of from $15 to $25 per month!

It should not be difficult to imagine what will happen on September 1, when, according to the law, the new monthly wage schedule is to be put into effect for about two million workers. There may be some confusion and consequently less sympathy around the prevailing wage issue. The press is assiduously creating the impression that only a few skilled mechanics are affected by this provision. This is, of course, untrue. Destruction of the prevailing rate affects even large numbers of the lowest paid Southern workers. But when, despite the silence of the press, it becomes known that workers who are earning as little as $40 a month on which to support their families may now be forced to suffer drastic slashes in these earnings even while they are required to work an additional number of hours, doubt and hesitation even on the part of middle class elements will be greatly dispelled. The present wave of protest can then be expected to swell into a torrent.

Nor is even this all. The Garner-Woodrum-Republican wrecking crew, in its excess of arrogance, included a large number of other iniquitous provisions in the 1940 Act. Some of these were impossible of enactment even by the tory-dominated Congress. They were defeated when presented for a vote in both chambers. But they were smuggled in behind the closed doors of the conference room and then blan-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

keted in under the general vote when no debate was permitted.

Thus, there is the so-called rotation clause, which requires the Administration to discharge all workers who have been employed eighteen months or more. Though these workers are eligible for reassignment to the program after thirty days compulsory "furlough," they cannot be reassigned so long as there are any applicants awaiting assignment who have not yet worked on the W.P.A. This clause will affect 600,000 workers by August 31. Thereafter, each month large numbers will be dropped as they reach the eighteen-month limit.

There is also the clause which altogether prohibits further operation of the Federal Theatre and permits operation of the other Arts projects only if they can find local sponsors. This has aroused every friend of democratic art and culture. Then there are reductions in the allowance for administrative expense which will hit about twelve thousand low-paid administrative workers. There is the provision requiring sponsors to contribute 25 per cent which will discourage and in some cases actually prevent cities and counties from sponsoring projects that could employ their jobless workers.

Each of these restrictive provisions of the Woodrum Act hits at a large body of workers. Each of them will hamper the operation of the works program. All of them combined will arouse the most intense and widespread resentment and threaten the very existence of the Works Program.

Every section of the labor movement has already gone into action. Though usually initiated by the A. F. of L., because of the crafts involved, the C.I.O. and the Workers Alliance have joined in such strikes as have already taken place. The Alliance has also designated a day for a nationwide stoppage and demonstration.

Progressive organizations have not failed to recognize the fact that the reactionaries will attempt to divert the struggle into a blind alley. Already those whose purpose it is to wreck the W.P.A. and at the same time lay the blame for the wreckage upon the New Deal are attempting to direct the struggle against the Administration. This gives them an opportunity to charge at the same time that labor is attempting to coerce the Administration into violation of the law as passed by Congress and yet place the unemployed and the progressive forces generally into sharp conflict with the New Deal Administration. It also makes possible a dissipation of the power of this great protest movement.

Most of the responsible leaders of all the organizations concerned have recognized from the outset both the need for immediate protest to induce prompt consideration by Congress of remedial legislation and also the advisability of careful preparation for the even more vigorous action that must take place in the next stage of the struggle. For this reason, the strikes that have taken place in the first few days have been either confined to the skilled workers who are in a better position to engage in a prolonged struggle or have been general stoppages of one to at most three days.

Unity is being forged in the various cities and in some cases on a statewide

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

basis. A. F. of L., C.I.O. and Workers Alliance officers and members are meeting together either in formal emergency conferences or in less formal sessions and are joining their forces in the fight around a common program and policy. It is certain that, regardless of other consequences, this struggle will serve greatly to stimulate and promote unity of labor and unity of employed and unemployed.

It is, of course, impossible to anticipate the results of this struggle as far as the immediate effects on the Federal relief and works program. Congress under the Garner-Republican leadership may again resort to some trick as a means of making their reactionary program stick. In the first test, Garner personally took a hand to prevent the Murray amendments from going to the friendly Committee on Labor and Education. Instead, these amendments, sponsored by twenty-two Senators, were shunted into the hostile Committee on Appropriations which is responsible for the Relief Act as it now stands. In the House of Representatives, Clifton Woodrum has declared that he would oppose any amendment of his infamous act. His answer to the protest of millions of people was "Let them squawk!"

If the act is left unchanged, the works program will be the center of bitter struggles. Labor cannot yield the right to a voice in the conditions, the wages and the hours that it will work. To yield would be to submit to what is tantamount to forced labor.

THE RIGHT TO WORK

One of the results of this struggle must be to define more clearly the purpose and character of the Federal Works Program. It is one thing for the government to say how much it will give to a needy person for means of subsistence. It is quite another matter when it declares how much it will pay to a worker for his labor. In the first instance the dispute is limited to a consideration of how much a family may need for sustenance. The other involves the fundamental issue of *the right of a worker to say at what price he is willing to sell his labor power.*

It is clear that the reactionaries are deliberately aiming at the complete destruction of the works program and seek to replace it with a direct relief program. The reasons for this are too well known to require repetition here. It is equally clear that the progressive forces of the country insist on a work program at decent wages and under decent conditions and are opposed to direct relief doles, whether federal, state or local.

The problem is a relatively new one. There has been little experience with government policy in dealing with this problem. Undoubtedly adjustments must be made in every point of view on this issue. While progressives of all shades will have no difficulty in choosing between a program that provides work and a program of doles, there can and will be many differences even among progressives as to the kind of work program that is most practical and as to the considerations that should be deemed most fundamental.

The W.P.A. has answered some of the problems, but only partially. There is an urgent need for a re-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

vamping of this program. It must be made more permanent. It must be permitted to undertake more rather than less heavy construction. It must also be permitted to develop projects that can employ more crafts and trades, providing work for shoemakers, furniture workers, auto and steel workers, etc., at their own trade or approximating it, instead of offering little more than ditch-digging. It must be broadened out so as to afford work opportunity to all willing workers and not merely to a relatively small proportion of the total who want but can't find work in private enterprise.

But even an improved public works program is by no means the answer that the unemployed, the labor movement and the progressive people of the country seek. The National Right to Work Congress gave voice to the real need and desire of the people when it urged a concerted crusade for economic recovery. What the people want is a program that will liberate the productive forces of the nation, that will employ idle men and idle money, that will increase the production and improve the distribution of real wealth. What most fired the imagination and roused the enthusiasm of the Right to Work Congress was the fact that the unemployed army could be reduced to five million by increasing the annual national income from the present 65 billion dollar level to 75 billion dollars. By an increase to 88 billion all employables could be employed and an annual income of not less than $2,000 could be provided for every family in the United States without any reduction in the income of those who now enjoy higher incomes.

In fighting for economic recovery, for a higher and better distributed national income, the people cannot, however, overlook the more immediate demand for an adequate program that can provide work and mass purchasing power even while big business persists in its sit-down strike. This means also that the purpose of this sit-down strike, which is to discredit the New Deal and undermine democratic government, must be thwarted.

This means that 1940 must be in the mind of every American who cherishes democracy and progress. The unemployed, who are most directly hit by the blows of reaction, are not disposed to forget the consequences of the 1938 elections. They can be rallied to prevent what would be a far more disastrous defeat in 1940. In this, the unemployed—labor as a whole—can be greatly aided by the vigorous united action of the trade unions—A. F. of L., C.I.O., and the Railroad Brotherhoods, together with all progressive forces.

The very difficulties, the serious crisis that has been produced by the rampage in the 76th Congress and in the legislatures in which reaction is dominant, have also provided the opportunities to organize the millions of still unorganized unemployed and to cement the unity of employed and unemployed for common action within a broad democratic front that can assure victory in 1940 for progress and recovery, for jobs and security.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SECONDARY ASPECTS OF MASS ORGANIZATION

BY WILLIAM Z. FOSTER

[*The sixth installment of Comrade Foster's series of articles on organizational problems, entitled "Specific American Features of the Democratic Front," will appear shortly in* THE COMMUNIST.—*The Editors.*]

THE primary purposes of mass organizations of workers, farmers and other toilers are the fundamental aims for which they are organized; their secondary aspects are the effects, intangible or concrete, produced within them by the impact of other movements and social forces. Thus, while an organization is founded to accomplish a basic task—its primary purpose—such as the achievement of specific political objectives, the attainment of certain economic ends, or the carrying on of educational activities, the organization invariably presents numerous secondary aspects. These are of two general categories, ideological and functional, and may be political, economic, fraternal, religious, cultural, technical or social, which the organization absorbs into its practice and structure from contact with the innumerable other organizations and trends in our national life.

There is an intermingling going on among the many mass movements and social currents. It is this that creates the secondary aspects we are discussing. Thus, the primary function of one organization becomes a secondary aspect of others. The auxiliary features in question are of profound significance to a mass organization and may determine whether it shall live or die. Sometimes the secondary aspects operate as reactionary capitalist controls over the masses and sometimes as healthful stabilizers of the given movement; altogether the question is one of the most complex and important phases of popular movements. Let us, therefore, signalize some of the two general groups of secondary aspects of mass organizations and learn what lessons we can about them.

1. IDEOLOGICAL SECONDARY ASPECTS

This type of secondary aspect of mass organizations originates in deep-running opinions, beliefs and prejudices among the masses. It includes various kinds of moods and movements, although here I shall deal with only a few of major consequence.

A. CAPITALIST ILLUSIONS

A secondary ideological characteristic of basic importance in American proletarian mass organization arises

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

because the working class in this country (despite its groping for a way out) has not yet broken with perspectives within capitalism. Although the workers in other countries—Great Britain, Germany, Italy, France, and to a lesser extent, Latin America—have come to realize, in a general way at least, the necessity to abolish capitalism, and notwithstanding that in the Soviet Union the workers and peasants have actually built socialism, the bulk of the workers in the United States, the greatest of all capitalist lands, have not yet become class conscious, and do not look beyond the framework of capitalism for the final solution of their class problem. Such capitalist illusions, originating, briefly stated, in the relatively better economic and political conditions enjoyed historically by the toilers, especially the labor aristocracy, in this country, have played a profound role in shaping their mass activities. They constitute a secondary aspect of vital importance, one which deeply affects every feature of American proletarian mass organization. They have enormously facilitated capitalist domination of these movements and of the working class as a whole, by opening the doors for betrayal by corrupt labor leaders, and by confusing the thought and crippling the action of the workers.

This secondary aspect of American mass organization being of course wholly harmful, our job is to remove it by giving the workers a socialist perspective. In this task is involved the whole question of building the democratic front, of organizing the struggle of the people against fascism and for peace and democracy, of educating the masses with our Party's fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism. The systematic liquidation of capitalist illusions and the achievement of a socialist outlook by the workers will have far-reaching consequences, not only upon every phase of their own organization and struggle — policy, structure, leadership and tactics—but also on popular mass movements in general.

B. RELIGION

Religion is another extremely important secondary aspect of American mass organization. Inevitably a social current so well organized and so deeply ingrained in the mind of the masses as religion has exerted a far-reaching effect upon the people's mass organizations of all types throughout their entire history. Political parties, trade unions, farmers' associations, fraternal orders and the many other kinds of broad mass movements in which the toilers participate in huge numbers have been fundamentally influenced in various ways by this powerful force. The employers have tirelessly exploited religion to control the people's organizations and they have often been unwittingly aided by Left-wing mistakes in dealing with it.

The numerous churches (and American bourgeois-democracy has served to multiply greatly the number of Protestant sects) have sedulously cultivated their causes within the mass organizations, and the resultant conflicts, especially those between Protestants and Catholics, have at times been acute. Consequently, the employers have been alert to provoke such sectarian clashes. In the main, however, the spirit of democratic

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tolerance has prevailed and mass solidarity been preserved. In the great fraternal organizations (which, with duplications, are estimated to number 50,000,000 members, including many millions of workers and farmers) there is a wide split between Catholics and Protestants; but this is not the case in mass organizations generally. Thus, there are in the United States no Catholic trade unions and, in our time, no special political parties based upon religious lines.

The triumph of mass solidarity over religious sectarianism is a tribute to American democracy. Communists must ever be keen to cultivate the democratic spirit of mutual tolerance among the religious sects in the people's mass organizations. A still greater lesson for us to learn, however, is how to work freely with religious strata for the accomplishment of democratic mass objectives, while at the same time carrying on our basic Marxist-Leninist educational work. A very serious mistake of the American Left wing during many years, and one it would not have made had it understood Marx and Lenin, has been its attempt arbitrarily to wave aside religious sentiments among the masses. Reactionary forces have always known how to take advantage of this short-sighted sectarian error by instigating the religious masses against the Left wing. In recent years, however, the Communist Party, with its policy of "the outstretched hand," has done much to overcome the harmful Left wing narrowness of former years and to develop a more healthy cooperation with the religious masses of the people in building the democratic front.

C. AMERICANISM

Patriotism, which naturally has always played a profound role in American popular movements of all kinds, is another vitally important secondary feature of mass organizations. The reactionary forces have been especially energetic in utilizing the patriotic sentiments of the masses for the purpose of dominating the organized movements of the people. They have never failed to cover up their every villainy with the Flag, distorting the whole body of revolutionary and democratic tradition of the country to their own anti-social ends. Thus, the isolationists use as their patron saint George Washington, who fought the Revolutionary War in alliance with France and with the support of Holland and Spain; the fascist-minded Liberty Leaguers bedeck themselves with the mantle of the revolutionary Thomas Jefferson; the big bankers profane the name of Abraham Lincoln to justify the open-shop policy, and the ultra-tory D.A.R. befouls the tradition of the American Revolution. Now, more than ever before, the fascists, with their demagogic nationalism, are shamelessly twisting and warping American historical traditions and mass patriotic sentiments to suit their destructive purposes.

On their own part, the progressive forces in the mass organizations have made considerable appeal to American patriotism and traditions for constructive ends. But this appeal has usually been weak, spasmodic and ineffective. The workers, farmers, professionals have not understood how to bring forth in their agitation the basically constructive role they have

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

played historically in building American democracy.

In this respect the revolutionary movement has been especially weak. From the foundation of the Socialist Labor Party in the 1870's, down through the life of the Socialist Party and the I.W.W., and during the early years of the Communist Party, there was a dominant tendency to ignore and to scorn American tradition and love of country. This arose out of a narrow, sectarian conception of internationalism, and it did much to weaken the position of the revolutionaries in the organizations of the patriotically minded toiling masses. Here again, a better study of Marx and Lenin would have prevented this grievous error. Only during the past few years, notably since the Seventh World Congress of the Communist International and through the writings of Comrade Browder, is real progress being made by our Party in correcting this costly mistake and in basing itself upon a correct Leninist line.

The cultivation of the democratic, revolutionary American traditions among the mass organizations is one of the most important tasks in the building of the democratic front. We must not permit the reactionaries to steal and distort the national traditions and aspirations of the people. The great democratic masses must be taught by constant reference to American history that it was their struggles in the past that built our republic, that the democratic front movement of today is the continuation of all the fights for liberty in the history of our country; that in the achievement of the current demands of the masses lies the fruition of all that is progressive and glorious in American history; that socialism is the climax toward which the entire historic struggle of the democratic American people inevitably tends. Doubly necessary also is it for the organizations of the foreign-born to develop and to link up their democratic national traditions with Americanism, in order to offset the present desperate efforts of the fascists to capture these many important organizations by reactionary-nationalistic agitation.

D. RACISM

National and racial chauvinism has long constituted an important secondary aspect of American mass organizations of various types. It is a potent instrument of reactionaries. In the middle of the 19th century there was the widespread Know-Nothing nativist movement, directed against the foreign-born workers, especially the Irish. Then, for generations there have been Jim-Crow color lines against Negroes in many kinds of mass organizations. And now we have to contend with the sinister growth of fascist-bred anti-Semitism. The malignancy of the danger of racist prejudice was exemplified by the tremendous spread of the anti-Negro, anti-foreigner, anti-Jewish, anti-Catholic Ku Klux Klan a few years ago and the upspringing in the present period of a whole series of fascist-like Black Legions, Silver Shirts, Crusaders, Coughlinites and similar movements, animated by a similar spirit of intolerance.

The Communist Party has always militantly fought against all racial and national chauvinism. Our Party's

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fight for Negro rights notably has been effective. The mass organizations of the growing democratic front are by no means yet free of narrow chauvinism. Especially there are still to be noted shameful barriers against Negroes in the A. F. of L. and Railroad Brotherhood unions. To eradicate all such prejudices of race and nationality among the masses now becomes more necessary than ever, in view of the rise of fascism, which feeds and lives upon such reactionary currents. Mass solidarity, regardless of race, creed, color and nationality, is an indispensable requirement for the building of a real democratic front of all the progressive forces.

E. DISCRIMINATION AGAINST WOMEN AND YOUTH

Under capitalism women have always occupied a position of inferiority—economically, politically and socially—a discrimination which has often reflected itself as a harmful secondary aspect within democratic mass organizations, including those of proletarian composition. Thus, some trade unions have "male" clauses in their constitutions which bar women from membership and from work in their crafts, and many others hinder them from becoming official leaders. Young workers of both sexes have also suffered various discriminations and repressions in economic, political and social organizations.

This situation is rapidly improving, however. Women, especially during the twenty years since they have gained the right to vote, have made spectacular progress in the fields of industry, education and politics. They are building up great organizations of their own and are also breaking through barriers and prejudices in the trade unions and other popular mass movements. For example, the New Dealers of the Democratic Party, realizing the women's new status, have outstripped the Republicans by securing to women many responsible party posts and elective political positions, including a seat in Roosevelt's cabinet. Woman's role in other mass organizations is likewise rapidly on the upgrade.

The youth also, notably within the past half-dozen years, have come forward politically in seven-league boots, overturning many hoary obstacles that stood in their way. They have initiated a big independent youth movement whose main center is the American Youth Congress, and they have also organized their forces within other mass movements. The Democratic and Republican Parties, becoming acutely youth-conscious, are building elaborate youth sections, and the churches, both Protestant and Catholic, have long since developed huge youth movements. The C.I.O. is rapidly expanding its youth program; but the A. F. of L. is still dangerously backward in this whole matter.

Discrimination against, and underestimation of, women and youth in democratic mass organizations, however subtle in form, constitute a detrimental secondary aspect of these movements and they must be abolished. This is especially necessary now, in view of the attempts of the reactionaries and fascists to capture politically the women and youth with demagogic agitation. Bringing the masses of women and youth into the fullest membership and leadership in

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the democratic front will broaden its outlook and vastly strengthen the whole movement.

F. RITUALISM

Ritualism is a characteristic secondary feature of American mass organizations of various sorts containing many millions of workers, farmers and professionals. It is widely prevalent and has been so since before the American Revolution. Americans love to lay aside the humdrum routine of life, dress themselves up as Christian Knights, Indian Chiefs, Chinese Mandarins or Oriental Potentates, and engage in ritualistic pomp and ceremony. In his *Cyclopedia of Fraternities,* Albert C. Stevens asserts: "In the United States there are more secret orders and a larger aggregate membership than in all other civilized countries." Much of the characteristic ritualism dates from the days of the medieval guilds and harks back to legendary times, and even to savagery.

Ritualism, aside from that of the churches, has its principal seat in the great fraternal societies. The trade unions, also, have long been permeated with it, as have the farmers' organizations. In the early days the Noble and Holy Order of the Knights of Labor and the Knights of St. Crispin, both genuine labor organizations, had elaborate, secret rituals; the Railroad Brotherhoods of today also possess extensive rituals; and scores of A. F. of L. craft unions still have symbolistic grips, signs, passwords, initiation ceremonies, burial services, secret conventions and other ritualistic practices.

Ritualism is a reflection of cultural poverty and backwardness, a hangover of medievalism. It has many roots and has served various purposes in mass organizations. It is one form of expression of the people's love of the imaginative and legendary, of pageantry and colorfulness, of cultural cravings that find no rational outlet. In early trade unions the ritualistic secrecy doubtless was a protective measure for the members, and in many instances ritualism has lent an element of interest to the mass organizations. But the fiery crosses, blood oaths and ghostly regalia of the Knights of the Ku Klux Klan show that the reactionaries have understood how to adapt ritualism to their purposes.

During the upswing of capitalism, notably since about the turn of the century, with the development of increasing opportunities for mass education and recreation, the masses began to display a diminishing interest in ritualism. Hence, the newer fraternal orders (Moose, Eagles, Owls, etc.) have less ritualism, and that which they have tends to run more to horseplay, and the younger trade unions have almost no ritualism whatever. Now, however, with the decay of capitalism and the spread of fascism, there is a fresh development of mystic ritualistic tendencies, with mysterious emblems, pagan gods and legends, and the other obscurantist medievalism which is being cultivated by reactionaries to capture the minds of the masses.

In progressive mass organizations little function can probably be found for typical ritualism, and Left elements have, therefore, been much (and unwisely) inclined to ignore the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

whole phenomenon. In this connection it is interesting to note that mass organizations predominantly of the foreign-born of Central and Eastern Europe, which for the most part were organized under Social-Democratic influence, are freer from ritualism than are native American organizations. Thus, characteristically, bodies such as the Workmen's Circle, International Workers Order, German Krankenkasse, Amalgamated Clothing Workers, and International Ladies' Garment Workers have no ritualism of any kind.

Sound policies of mass organization demand, however, that care be taken to satisfy the mass love of mystery, secrecy, ceremony, legend, romance and splendor that gives birth to ritualism under American conditions. This can be done, in a substantial measure at least, by cultivating democratic pageantry, parades, demonstrations, carnivals, the theater, music, art, choral singing, rhythmic dancing and the like, in popular mass organizations. In all such features the democratic people's movements, especially those of the workers and farmers, are at present poorly developed. Improvements along this line will pay big dividends in the shape of more solid mass organization and additional safeguards against fascist mystic demagogy.

2. Functional Secondary Aspects

This type of secondary aspects has to do with definite objectives of the given mass organization. In themselves they may be extremely important; nevertheless, they do not constitute the primary purpose of the organization. They, like the ideological secondary aspects, are many in number, but here I shall cite only a few of the greatest importance in mass organizations generally.

A. POLITICS

Politics, the primary function of political parties, has always manifested itself as a secondary aspect of great importance in every type of popular mass organization. For the most part in such movements of the people, including trade unions, farmers' associations, professional guilds, fraternal societies, veterans' movements, etc., politics, as a secondary aspect, has appeared traditionally under the guise of "non-politicalism" and "non-partisanship." Despite such neutral-sounding slogans, however, the leaders of the Republican and Democratic Parties early developed effective techniques of political control in the various mass organizations and have successfully exploited them to cultivate conservative moods among the people, to make war against progressive legislation, and to elect reactionary candidates to political office. The worst sufferers in this respect have been the trade unions and the farmers' organizations, the history of which is saturated with shameful sell-outs by corrupt leaders sailing under flags of political non-partisanism.

But a great change is now taking place in this whole situation. Under the blows of the economic crisis, with its consequent political awakening of the masses, sharpening of the class struggle on all sectors, and rapid building of the democratic front, there is a new political breeze blowing through the people's mass organiza-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tions of all kinds. Capitalist controls over them are weakening. This is true most of all in the trade unions and farmers' organizations. But it is also true in varying degrees of innumerable other mass organizations of women, youth, veterans, unemployed, Negroes, professionals and foreign-born, and also of the huge popular fraternal orders, the lay religious associations, the peace groups, etc., all of which contain huge numbers of workers. These mass movements are casting off their old garments of non-politicalism and non-partisanship, which served the reactionaries so well, and are constantly assuming a more definitely democratic position on political questions. The New Deal ferment is everywhere at work among them.

To politicalize these great mass movements of the people, especially those of the workers and farmers, and to draw them together into a firm political alignment against reaction, are a central task in building the democratic front. It is a job requiring intelligence, persistence and flexibility. Among the workers' and farmers' organizations the route is a relatively straight one, breaking through old policies of "non-politicalism" and "non-partisanship" and bringing about direct affiliation with, and support of, the democratic front. Among other popular mass movements, however, which have either a heavier admixture of petty-bourgeois elements or have primary functions of not so immediately a class-struggle character and where non-political traditions are very strong, it is necessary to proceed with more diffused forms and methods in order politically to educate these organized masses to get them to support individual New Deal programs, to enlist their endorsement of specific election candidates, etc., and at the same time to avoid harmful splits.

B. FRATERNAL INSURANCE

Still another significant secondary aspect of American mass organizations is fraternal insurance. The masses have always felt a great need for financial protection against sickness, accident, old age, death and other hazards. This need, long practically ignored by the government, was only partially met by the big bourgeois insurance companies and fraternal societies, with the result that many types of mass organizations adopted fraternal insurance as auxiliary features. Especially in the case of the trade unions of skilled workers the sick-and-death-benefit institutions grew quite elaborate. Under conservative union leadership these union benefit systems dulled the political struggle for government social insurance; but, on the other hand, they have also unquestionably often served as important stabilizers of the unions through giving the workers added incentives for membership. Too frequently in the past Left wingers have summarily condemned all such benefit systems as harmful and reactionary.

In view of the present-day development of state and national government social insurance in the United States, the whole question of auxiliary insurance features of mass organizations presents itself under new conditions and requires careful restudy. Already fresh trends are observable regarding such insurance. Among others, there are the new-type

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

medical plans now being developed in various C.I.O. unions, which differ considerably from the customary trade union sick and death benefits. Undoubtedly these new mutualist systems of furnishing medical aid directly to the membership on the basis of small monthly payments, if properly organized, can become serious factors in stabilizing the young C.I.O. organizations. But they should not be considered substitutes for general economic and political pressure upon the employers and the state to establish comprehensive health and other social insurance provisions within their respective spheres.

C. SOCIAL ACTIVITIES

Social activities constitute another important secondary aspect of mass organizations, there being a widespread tendency to incorporate them into organized movements of the most diverse character. The bourgeois-controlled mass organizations have been very alert in this matter, their leaders realizing the attractive power of such features for the masses. The big fraternal and religious bodies especially stimulate many kinds of social activities, and the employers, too, did not fail to add many similar institutions, particularly sports, to their company unions to give them more allurement for the workers. The Democratic Party, in its local branches, has long concerned itself with these matters.

While the organizations of workers and farmers have also paid much attention to their social side, nevertheless, in general, they have confined themselves too narrowly to their main economic and political programs. They have underestimated the educational and organizational value of cultivating social and entertainment activities among their masses. Especially have they grievously neglected to organize their youth's sports. In this whole matter, they have lagged far behind European workers' organizations.

In recent years the Communist Party and the Young Communist League have become increasingly conscious of the important role of organized sociability in the mass movement. In particular they have come to appreciate the great significance of sport. It is a political necessity also that the trade unions and other democratic mass organizations should expand their present altogether too sketchy social life. Picnics, dances, card parties, concerts, banquets, excursions, tours, hiking, physical culture and the like are great cementers of mass organization and are of first-rate significance in building the democratic front.

D. EDUCATION

Mass organizations of all kinds, in order to explain their primary purposes, must carry on a certain amount of educational work. In many instances, especially in proletarian organizations, this educational work tends to become an important secondary aspect by extending far beyond the narrow needs of popularizing the organization's basic function. In working-class political parties—the early Socialist Labor Party, the Socialist Party of twenty years ago, the various Farmer-Labor Parties, the Communist Party—this educational work reached its highest development. The Communist Party of today, with

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

its network of daily papers, literature publications and schools, is by far the most elaborate educational institution ever built up by the American working class.

The A. F. of L. craft unions have been notoriously weak in their educational work, venturing only scatteringly beyond the immediate economic and political problems of their own spheres, although in recent years their outlook has been considerably broadened politically. For the most part they have no definitely organized department for educational activities. The needle trades unions have been the pioneers in trade union educational work. The new C.I.O. unions are also making big strides in this matter and are generally on a higher educational level than the old craft unions.

The importance of developing the educational activities of the mass organizations cannot be overstressed. This educational work, starting from the basis of explaining the primary function of the given mass organization of workers, farmers, veterans, unemployed, Negroes, youth, etc., must proceed in the direction of giving the masses a broad understanding of their general economic, political, cultural and social problems. Communists, above all others, should be leaders in developing this vital educational work.

SUMMARY

In the preceding pages I have indicated some of the major secondary aspects of mass organizations, namely, capitalist illusions, religion, patriotism, racism, discriminations against women and youth, ritualism, politics, fraternal insurance, social activities and education. Sometimes these and other secondary aspects manifest themselves within a given organization as definite institutions and sometimes merely as currents of thought among the membership. Frequently, as negative forces, they serve as means by which reactionaries maintain mass control; and often, constructive in character, they are healthful elements in strengthening the given organization. In all cases they are extremely important, and even decisive.

Communists especially should study carefully this fundamental, if secondary, phase of mass organization. To do this, we should draw upon the rich experience of all the mass organizations of the people—political parties, trade unions, farmers' organizations, religious bodies, fraternal societies, national group organizations, cooperatives, veterans' organizations, unemployed movements, cultural societies, women's clubs, patriotic orders, peace movements, technical guilds, youth associations and many others.

While we are examining more sharply the forms and practices of these great organizations, with their tens of millions of worker and farmer members, we should also pay much closer attention than in the past to winning them for the democratic cause. The capitalists, on their part, have always been conscious of the great significance of the huge mass movements and have left no stone unturned to control them.

A mistake of the American Left wing, covering two generations past, was to ignore and underestimate the secondary aspects of mass organiza-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tions, enlarged upon in this article; that is, to attempt to confine popular mass movements too narrowly to their primary objectives. This was a sectarian tendency to over-simplify the whole question of mass organization. The result was a great deal of lost motion, much needless isolation from the masses. A large part of the Communist Party's recent improvement in mass work is precisely its growing understanding in utilizing the secondary aspects of mass organization for building the democratic front.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LEGISLATIVE PROBLEMS IN ILLINOIS

BY JACK MARTIN
Legislative Secretary, Illinois State Committee, Communist Party

THE Sixty-first Illinois General Assembly, recently adjourned, can be characterized as having been one of the more progressive of the sessions in recent years in, what may sound paradoxical, a negative fashion. This evaluation necessarily takes into account the fact that the Democratic majority in the Senate was by no means a solid New Deal majority and that the House had a Republican majority. During this session the voices of labor and the democratic forces were listened to more earnestly than ever before, and marked success attended the fight of the progressives to defeat the most menacing of the reactionary bills sponsored by the Republican Party. Encouraged and spurred by the joint action of the A. F. of L., C.I.O., and railroad unions, and by a hitherto unknown unity of all progressive forces, which reached its height in the State Conference for Social Legislation held on May 31, the Democratic Party, under the leadership of Mayor Edward J. Kelly of Chicago, pursued what was in the main a united policy based on a New Deal program.

As a result, the New Deal democracy in the state can record certain outstanding victories. Chief among them are, first, the defeat of the Lantz Bill, which aimed to put the unions in a straitjacket; second, the defeat of the Collins (Little Dies) Bill, designed to set up a red-baiting weapon to attack the New Deal in 1940; third, the defeat of the *Tribune*-sponsored Public Service Building Corporation Bill, intended to paralyze low-cost Federal housing in Illinois, fourth, increase in old age pension payments by ten dollars a month, and permission hereafter to old age pensioners to retain insurance policies up to a value of $1,000; fifth, increase in workmen's compensation benefits; sixth, passage of the bill to give women the right to serve on juries; seventh, the appropriation of $60,000,000 for the building of a super-highway system; eighth, passage of bill requiring prevailing wage rates on public works.

A qualified victory was the allotment of $72,000,000 for relief for a period of eighteen months. This was a victory for the progressives, inasmuch as this appropriation is the result of a struggle by the New Dealers against the attempts of the Republicans to cut even this inadequate amount. While this allows only $4,000,000 a month—$2,000,000 below the minimum required, according to Leo M. Lyons, secretary of the Illinois Emergency Relief Commission, to provide a subsistence budget for the relief families in Illinois—it is consid-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

erably better than the appropriation of only $3,000,000 per month which the Republicans fought to put over.

But while the foregoing marked a forward step in the organization of the people's forces, many of the most crucial problems were not met, and the legislature failed to enact a positive program of social legislation. Most of the labor bills sponsored by the Illinois Federation of Labor and Labor's Non-Partisan League failed to pass, including the vital anti-injunction bill. Proposals to amend the state constitution to make possible a state income tax were defeated. The relief appropriation is decidedly inadequate, and a whole series of urgent needs of the people, such as housing, health, and the high cost of living, were not dealt with.

The explanation for this must be sought for in the still insufficient awareness and alertness of the people to problems of legislation, to the reactionary role of the Republican Party, and the aid given to reaction by anti-New Deal Democrats, such as Representative Adamowski, and in the inadequate sustained organized pressure of the progressive forces.

The failure to meet the relief, tax and other problems dare not be forgotten by the New Dealers. It is necessary to see that demagogues and reactionaries will attempt to point the finger at the New Deal as responsible for this situation. The New Dealers must launch a powerful movement for the *calling of a special session of the state legislature,* which otherwise will not meet again until 1941. A special session will have to be fought for and carried through to a successful conclusion. It can be done. It must be done if victory in 1940 is to be assured for the New Deal in Illinois.

For the type of legislation emanating from Springfield in the next twelve months will decide to a great extent whether Illinois will go New Deal. In casting their votes, the people will be decisively influenced by the kind of fight for progressive social legislation conducted in the state legislature in the coming period by the New Dealers. The people do not want New Dealers who pull their punches. They want to see the New Deal put into life locally. Short of that they may be driven to try the demagogic promises of the Republicans.

Outstanding among the unsolved tasks before the special session will be that of relief. A huge percentage of Illinois citizenry are dependent on relief for their very subsistence, and they will draw conclusions for 1940 from the actions of the state legislature in meeting their needs.

At the end of April of this year the legislature appropriated emergency relief funds for the months of May and June. The appropriation was a compromise. *It failed to meet the needs of the unemployed.* True, the Kelly forces worked hard to achieve the passage of even the amount that was appropriated. But the fact remains that the unemployed in Cook County now receive only 65 per cent of a so-called "normal" budget, as against the 85 per cent level they received previously.

It would be dangerous to assume that the 1,300,000 persons in Illinois who are dependent on public agencies for their subsistence, with only a comparatively small proportion reached by such organs as the *Daily Record,*

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

understood the role of the Republicans in forcing the 20 per cent cut. Those who would lead the progressive camp must tirelessly explain the actualities of the struggle—point out that the Kelly forces might have won a one hundred per cent restoration of the budget, but only to the extent that they were supported by a powerful and sustained mass movement.

It was in this situation that Governor Horner chose to come out with an "economy" speech. Yes, he said, the unemployed should get assistance, so should the aged, so should the teachers—but "the budget must be balanced."

BUDGET AND TAXES

Governor Horner must be shown that he falls into a trap in listening to the cries of America's tory gang that the budget must be balanced. Yes, it would be touching, this solicitude of reaction for the welfare of the budget—if it did not mask the deadliest of intentions to the welfare of America.

The budget must be balanced, they say—men may go hungry, children may starve—but there is hope in the land if the budget is balanced. Though there be distress throughout the length and breadth of our country; though far more than one-third of the people are ill-fed, ill-clothed, ill-housed; though slow starvation is the fate of hundreds of thousands, balance the budget, do not appropriate the funds that are necessary for the social welfare of the people, "save the future generations" from the payment of bills.

Perhaps, though, there is another motive that explains this economy urge? Can it be that these men wish to make sure that their bond and interest payments will be guaranteed? Are they afraid that the government might decide to tax the surplus funds of industry, the accumulated profits of industry, to feed, clothe and house the millions at the expense of diminishing the stream of bond and interest payments to America's sixty families?

There is still another aspect of this tax question. The progressive and liberal democracy must understand that unless this tax question is solved, on this issue alone reaction will ride to victory. Reaction is utilizing the tax question to divide the people, to stir up antagonisms between labor and the middle class, between the unemployed and the employed, between the city folk and the farmer. It is time that the progressive camp boldly take up this question and not allow itself to be put on the defensive. The basic question before the New Deal in Congress and the state legislatures is: *shall the human budget or the bankers' budget be balanced?* The New Deal answer must be a program of health, education, housing, public works, jobs for the unemployed, social and national security. With it must go a tax program to make possible this program of social welfare, and to make this possible by taxing the wealthy class and not by taking back with the left hand what the right hand has given.

In organizing the people around a progressive tax program, the task of dramatizing the whole question stands out. For example, the people must be helped to draw the fullest conclusions from a comparison of the difficulty met by the Ward Bill to appropriate

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

$3,000,000 emergency relief and the ease with which Senate Bill 117 passed, a bill setting aside $38,000,000 for the payment of interest and retirement of state bonded indebtedness.

The relief budget was cut 20 per cent. But a 20 per cent cut in the relief budget is not just 20 per cent, it is 20 per cent off the $35.27 which was the *total* monthly relief budget in May for a family of four in Chicago —total for all purposes. That 20 per cent cut may have safeguarded interest payments to some LaSalle Street banks, but it also meant that a few more young people left home, a few more homes were broken up, a few more human beings clamored for space at the overcrowded County Hospital, a few more minds cracked under the strain, a few more years were stolen from the lives of the working class.

It should be continuously and tirelessly hammered home that under the present state taxation system, 90 per cent of the taxes are paid by the worker, farmer, small business man, and small home-owner. It is a system which makes it a matter of child's play for the finance capitalist whose property is concealed behind pieces of paper—mortgages, stocks, bonds and the like—to evade taxation. Here are some figures to illustrate, taken from a pamphlet dealing with the question of a constitutional convention, published by the Legislative Reference Bureau, a state department:

"More than two and one-quarter billions of dollars of bank deposits alone escape taxation in Illinois. . . . Attention is drawn to the assessment of stocks and bonds in Cook County, in 1929, when the value and volume of these securities were at their highest. The assessed value was $739,857 and the assessed full value $1,997,613," although "many individuals alone owned more than was assessed for the entire country; and the outstanding bonds of each of a great many business corporations owned mostly by residents of Cook County exceeded the assessor's figures many times."

While the wealthy escape taxation, the workers and farmers are heavily hit by the real estate tax, which bears with full severity on the small home and farm, and by the 3 per cent sales tax which has aptly been called an "upside down income tax" and a tax based upon "inability to resist rather than ability to pay."

As opposed to this sort of tax program, the New Deal democracy must fight for a tax program to include: passage of a state income tax as the keystone; a tax on bank deposits; a tax on the receipts of interest, dividends, bonuses, fees, charges, and profits from the sales of securities by banks, insurance companies, municipalities; a chain store tax; a tax on stock and bond transfers; graduated taxation on gross receipts of businesses doing more than $50,000 a year, etc.

SUSTAINED STRUGGLE BY PROGRESSIVE FORCES

But to achieve this program will require, in the words of Earl Browder, "concerted daily action by the masses themselves, at the bottom, in the localities and municipalities."

This brings us to the key question of organization of the democratic camp. In brief, the problem is this: how to achieve the *sustained, consistent, organized* work to match the sustained, consistent organized work of the reactionaries.

Let us take as an example the cam-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

paign to defeat the anti-labor Lantz Bill. This bill was one of a host of similar bills that have been introduced by the Republican Party under the guidance of its central command in the legislatures of most of the important states. In practice it would have nullified the Wagner Act in the state.

The bill so alarmed labor that it has led to one most excellent result: organized unity of C.I.O. and A. F. of L., first to defeat this bill and then with regard to other legislation. At one hearing 400 labor leaders joined in such powerful unity that the Senate Committee at the conclusion of the hearing adjourned with a promise not to do anything further about the bill.

But here labor learned a big lesson. The committee hearing the bill waited until the delegations left Springfield, they waited until the resolutions and letters of protest ceased coming in—then they quietly met and voted to recommend the bill.

Conclusions for labor and the progressive camp: (1) labor unity cannot be sporadic and isolated, but must be strengthened and sustained; (2) reaction is determined and unscrupulous; eternal vigilance is still the price of liberty; (3) it is necessary to develop the organizational forms and methods of work in the legislative field, watching the activity in the state and federal legislatures like hawks, responding quickly to developments, and raising to the utmost the level of development of legislative work.

When labor received the double cross it carried its move toward unity still further with electrifying results. On May 24 a joint union appeal against the bill was issued, signed by representatives of the Illinois State Federation of Labor, the Congress of Industrial Organizations, the Railroad Brotherhoods, and the Women's Trade Union League.

A week later the bill was defeated in the State Senate by a vote of 23 to 16, while the galleries were crowded with labor delegations and delegates of the first Illinois State Legislative Conference which had opened on that day. Said Senator Harold Ward of Chicago, leader of the fight against the Lantz Bill and Kelly spokesman:

"The Republican press has disowned responsibility for this bill. How will they explain the vote here today? The Democratic Party has always enjoyed the confidence of labor. Our main support is the laboring men and women of the state. There has been some talk of 1940 around here. After this vote is announced, the Democrats will be returned to office for another four years in 1940."

In considering forms and methods of legislative work, it is necessary to stress particularly the following:

a. The necessity of coordinated action behind the legislative programs of such organizations as the A. F. of L., the C.I.O., the Railroad Brotherhoods, the Workers Alliance, the Parents and Teachers Association, A Better Chicago League, and the Illinois League of Women Voters. Indispensable is the unity of labor's organizations. Through conferences, through joint delegations, through separate delegations lobbying on the same measures, through resolutions, in one form and another, unity of action is being achieved.

b. The setting up of a network of legislative committees in all organ-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

izations of the people to guarantee a continuous flow of letters, telegrams and resolutions reaching the legislators from the folks back home. The reactionaries, having at their disposal financial and other resources, have developed this form of pressure to a high degree. The progressive forces must do likewise.

c. A tremendously important role in developing the unity of the people to make their will evident was played by the legislative conferences that took place in the course of the Congressional elections last fall and in the course of the aldermanic elections in Chicago this spring. Such conferences are a new feature of American political life. It is necessary to remedy one outstanding weakness in their work so far, that is, the failure of continuations committees set up by such conferences to carry through continuous legislative campaigns, organize mass meetings, delegations, and lobbying activities, and in general work in a sustained way in behalf of progressive legislation, and to report back regularly to their parent bodies.

d. The building of progressive blocs in Congress and the state legislature. This means the establishing of personal contact with individual Congressmen, state legislators, aldermen, and other political figures by the members of the various trade unions, peace, women's, youth, Negro and other organizations; this means a most flexible and sympathetic approach to the new progressive outlook of political machines or sections of political machines; this means more directly involving these decisive groups and individuals.

e. Every election, no matter what its character, must be recognized as being a struggle between the New Deal and the reactionary opposition. The June judicial elections were one example. The Republicans broadcast far and wide their attacks on the New Deal. The Democratic judicial slate, they said, was backed by the Kelly-Nash machine, and they proceeded demagogically to befuddle the issues of taxation, unemployment, clean government, etc. The labor and New Deal forces, however, took the counter-offensive, with the result that the Democratic slate won a two-to-one victory.

f. The necessity of special forms of organization and appeal for the women, the youth—especially the first voters, and the national minority groups. A high degree of organization obtains among all these categories, with most of the organizations taking a progressive outlook. Such an organization as the League of Women Voters, for example, has gone on record nationally against a foreign policy of isolation. The youth organizations are very strongly for the New Deal and progress. This was shown in the Chicago municipal elections in the way Protestant, Catholic, Negro, Jewish, American Youth Congress, Y.M.C.A. and Y.W.C.A. and other groups united in the Non-Partisan Youth Committee for the reelection of Mayor Kelly. The importance of the national minority groups in Illinois cannot be overestimated. In the city of Chicago the foreign-born, together with those born here of foreign parentage, constitute a majority of the population. The major political parties have long recognized their importance. Because of their hatred of fascism, these groups

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

belong in the army of the New Deal. This is true of such groups as the Czechs, the Poles, the Jews and others. But a big task is that of overcoming the mistaken tendency among some New Dealers to relinquish the "German vote" to the reactionary camp.

g. The necessity of building in the city and state the circulation of a labor and progressive press, and in the first place, of the *Daily Record*. It is doubtful whether without the *Daily Record* the Chicago elections would have taken the course they did. But while the paper was able during the election campaign through extraordinary efforts to finance an enormously increased circulation, the task of circulation building in preparation for 1940 becomes the task of all who call themselves progressive. There is no other medium so admirably fitted to bring clarity and organization into that still considerably spontaneous movement of the American people which is developing into the democratic front.

CHIEF LEGISLATIVE TASKS

Chief among the legislative tasks that face the democratic front, in addition to those already discussed, are the following: farm legislation, old age pensions, constitutional convention, passage of an anti-injunction law, defeat of anti-alien legislation, the struggle for peace.

In the last few decades the farmers of Illinois have in the main voted Republican. In the 1940 elections it is imperative that this be changed, that the progressive traditions of the 1870's and 1890's—when the Illinois farmer was the center of the Grange movement and voted in masses for the Greenbackers, Populists, and the third party movements of that period —be revived. But the key to this is the beginning of a serious and systematic attempt by labor to help the farmer achieve more equitable prices and marketing facilities for his products, and by fighting for old age pensions, for rural W.P.A. projects, rural electrification, health protection, education and similar needs of the farmer.

The old age pensions movement is one which in certain areas in Illinois, such as Peoria, determines the course of elections. In the last elections the movement went Republican on the basis of demagogic promises to support the Townsend Plan. The followers of the Townsend movement must be won to the progressive movement where they belong.

The question of legislation affecting peace must be more sharply brought forward in the legislative movements. There is a tendency to leave out this question, on the "theory" that peace is a question for Congress and not for local legislative bodies to consider. Resolutions in support of a progressive foreign policy can be introduced into governing bodies of the state and its political subdivisions. More aggressive action by trade union bodies is essential. The women, youth and national groups can be mobilized on this question.

The anti-alien bills introduced by the Republican Party in state legislatures throughout the country and in Congress are one of the most serious attacks yet made on the democratic institutions and practices of our country. They follow the Hitler tactic of splitting the unity of the people on the basis of incitement

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

against one section of the population. A good example was the introduction in the Illinois legislature of fifteen bills to prohibit the issuance of licenses to aliens for the practicing of a number of professions, in most of which aliens constitute an infinitesimal proportion of the profession. This insidious attack on our democracy must be fought relentlessly.

The calling of a constitutional convention more and more emerges as a key question before the people of Illinois. We have discussed the necessity of such a convention in order to solve the tax problem. But in addition there are the following urgent questions:

(a) To reapportion the state: the last reapportionment was in 1901; today, Cook County, with over 52 per cent of the population, has only nineteen senatorial districts, although it is entitled to twenty-seven. (b) Home rule: Chicago, a metropolis with all the many problems of labor and industry, housing and health, relief, education, transportation, etc., must be given large powers of self-government. (c) A new charter of labor's right to organize, strike and meet. (d) A democratic election law.

That the opinions we express here reflect those of the ever-growing progressive forces of democracy was demonstrated by the historical Illinois State Legislative Conference called in Springfield, the capital city, on May 31. Held during the final sessions of the legislature, it exerted a powerful weight to balance the course of legislation in the direction of progress and democracy.

Delegates numbered 225, representing some 225 organizations and perhaps as high as 500,000 people. They came from all sections of the state and represented almost every type of organization—C.I.O., A. F. of L., teachers, farm, youth, health, unemployed, social service, religious and many others. A forward step in the history of the state was the joint participation of labor and agricultural organizations.

The conference was welcomed by the mayor of Springfield, and was addressed by Mayor Kelly of Chicago, Lieutenant-Governor John Stelle, and a number of state senators and representatives. Mayor Kelly in his talk progressed further as a staunch New Dealer. "It is not enough that our people should not starve," said the mayor on the matter of relief. "There should be some guarantee of the minimum essentials of health and decency that are a part of our American standard of living." Emphasizing the need for unity of farmer and city worker, the mayor said: "I must also be mindful of the fact that the farmer and the industrial worker must share in the liberties and opportunities of democracy. Both deserve the same safeguard against disease, crime and bottomless poverty. Both deserve the same rewards in free education, social relations and earning capacity."

Support of the principles of the New Deal rang out in all the keynote addresses of the day. Delegates approved or condemned many bills under consideration by the state legislature dealing with relief and social security, health, old age pensions, civil liberties, labor, agriculture, education, and constitutional and election reform. Particular stress was laid upon the necessity of appropriating

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

at least $6,000,000 a month for relief purposes in Illinois.

The conference set up a continuations committee and voted that this committee contact similar organizations in other states and explore the possibility of a national legislative conference some time next year.

Without doubt this conference did much to crystallize a progressive bloc in the state legislature, which will emerge the more firmly as farmer, labor and city middle class unity is achieved back home by the democratic front.

THE COMMUNIST PARTY AND LEGISLATIVE WORK

It is clear that the starting point of legislative work is the neighborhood and the community. Here the people are rooted, here is where the legislator goes when he wants to know how his constituents feel on matters. A hundred and fifty years of experience have taught the political machines that no campaigning can be effective unless it is done on the basis of precinct and ward. Therefore the organization and methods of work of the Party must be studied to see if they are fitted to carry on effective legislative work and to enable the Party to play the important role in American political life that it must.

An examination of the Party structure in Chicago shows that too much of the center of gravity of our work still lies in the section and its apparatus and not enough in the ward branch and its apparatus. The present sections are not constituted on the basis of well defined economic and social areas, and they do not give concrete, day-to-day guidance to each individual branch. We have developed in the past few years in the branch of 50, 75 or 100 members a form of organization radically different from the old units of ten or fifteen, and yet we are attempting to meet the problems of giving leadership through a form of organization which arose to meet the needs of a Party organized in small units.

Today it has become imperative that the best forces of the Party be released for the task of giving daily organizational and political guidance to the ward organizations of the Party. Nine-tenths of our present section apparatus should be released for direct work in a Party branch. This is the guarantee that we shall build the Party in the communities as an integral organization of the people. Capable forces must be released who will educate and train a whole corps of political leaders for our branches and work jointly with this new leadership to meet, in the words of Comrade Browder, "the accumulation of unsolved problems of adjustment of the Party to its tasks and environment."

As we make the branches centers of live political discussion and activity, as we develop the understanding and ability of the branch organizers and branch executives, as we learn how to involve every individual Party member in political work, as we create branches which will eventually make possible the development of a body of real leaders in ward work, to that extent will we also find a tremendous surging forward of the democratic front which will be built on an indestructible basis of the unity of the people in the precincts and wards.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

AFTER THE LIQUIDATED BALFOUR DECLARATION IN PALESTINE

BY M. WELNER

(Correspondence from Palestine)

THE Jewish settlement in Palestine has just been living through bitter, painful days—in the very midst of the spring month of May. And who knows whether, as a result of this, the future days will not be even more difficult and painful?

On the night of May 17, the Jewish settlement received, in deep sorrow, through the Jerusalem radio, the official "White Book" of the Chamberlain-Halifax-MacDonald government. The Balfour Declaration, which pointed toward Palestine as a National Home for the Jews, has passed away to the other world, where lie many documents and "National Homes" that sprang into being with the first World War and that have now disappeared with the newly approaching world war.

ZIONISTS BETRAYED BY CHAMBERLAIN'S "WHITE BOOK"

The blow for the Jews in Palestine did not come of a sudden. For many days beforehand, the Jewish people knew that it was inevitable, that all the springs put into motion by the Zionist leadership in London, in Washington, as well as in Paris, to help in avoiding the decree, would not help as they had helped on previous occasions. The present rulers in England, heavily enmeshed in their own entanglements, could not continue any longer with their two-faced game, with all its hypocritical words and promises for Jewish Zionists. In the dangerous situation that threatens the British Empire in the Mediterranean, the Chamberlain government, under pressure of the Arab masses in Palestine and of the Arab governments in the surrounding countries, has attempted to alleviate its predicament by throwing into the river all of its fake pledges and declarations, with their exaggerated hopes and dreams, including the Balfour Declaration. This plan of liquidation, born in London over half a year ago during the Munich days, has now come to light through the "White Book," given forth on the night of May 17.

The new "White Book" contains no less of hypocrisy, and perhaps even more, than all the former pronouncements with regard to the Palestine question. The only difference is that here we have everything in reverse form; instead of promises to the Jews, there are here pledges to the Arabs,

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

foggy pledges in the style of "If it please the Lord." The only thing clear in the document is that all former promises to Jews have now become null and void, that the Jews must forever remain a minority in Palestine, and that they will be provided with—minority rights.

The inhabitants of the Jewish settlement in Palestine and the broad Jewish masses, who until now have been lulled with sweet dreams inspired by the myopic Zionist leaders, have now seen their real situation. The "White Book" has aroused the Jewish population in Palestine as never before. Also, the three years of bloody events in the country, with the accompanying economic ruin and embittered passions, have contributed toward depressing the spirit of the people. Nevertheless, the majority of the people have been thinking unanalytically that there was reason in their sufferings, that soon the hindrances would be overcome—that the British power would help. For did not Britain lean upon Zionism, and is she not interested in it?

However, with the approach of a new World War and with the various factors likely to determine the fate of the British Empire, it appeared that the Arabs too were a matter to be reckoned with, since they are concentrated in millions around the Mediterranean; that a pro-Zionist policy in Palestine, by antagonizing the Arabs, could only *handicap* the British Empire in the coming war. Thus, the British government has turned away from Zionism, and the hopes of many Jews throughout the world have suddenly been seen in their true light as dreams that have passed away! Now people are reflecting, they are looking around to see where they are, what they have accomplished, and what prospects they can now expect in Palestine! Now they are considering the hundreds of victims, the dead and the maimed, the ruined economy, the adverse environment of an embittered Arab population, at a time when a terrible war is threatened by fascist Italy!

ANTI-BRITISH PROTEST AMONG THE ZIONISTS

Stormy waves of embitterment, of hatred and scorn for the London extortionists, are now rising in all corners of the Palestine Jewish settlement, among the adult and the young —regardless of party and line. This time, even the officials of the Jewish Agency, the Zionist leaders, have not attempted to restrain expressions of excitement and disillusionment on the part of the Jewish population. At a closed conference of the narrow Zionist Action Committee,* it was decided recently to organize a campaign of protest and certain forms of passive resistance, because, as everybody, with the exception of the fanatical Revisionists,** understands, it is futile to speak of an active struggle of the Jewish settlement through an

* Zionist Action Committee—The inner executive or bureau of the executive of the world Zionist Organization.—*The Editors.*

** Revisionists—Members of the New Zionist Organization, Jewish fascists led by Vladimir Jabotinsky, working in the interests of Mussolini. They are called "Revisionists" because of their slogan for a revision of Zionist policies. They contend that the Zionist organization led by Dr. Chaim Weizmann is not militant from the nationalist-chauvinist standpoint. The Revisionists are for an armed struggle against the Arabs and are now conducting a campaign of terrorism in Palestine.—*The Editors.*

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

armed uprising. Such a course would mean the complete destruction of the settlement.

The present leaders of the Jewish Agency * have tried and are constantly trying to come to terms with the Revisionists, so that the latter may not destroy their plans. It was expected that on the proclaimed day of protest, May 18, there would be a united action on the part of the entire Jewish settlement against the British policy. But the Revisionist wolf (Vladimir Jabotinsky) cannot rid himself of his skin. At the very last moment it was decided, according to Jabotinsky's telegraphed order, to break the united action. His telegram meant: "No aid to Weizmann, no helping him get out of his tangle. . . ." And his followers from the wild and backward strata of the Eastern communities sought to turn the day of protest into an attempt to secure their own domination over the settlement. There occurred various hooligan attacks on workers and even on representatives of bourgeois and reactionary Zionists, *e.g.*, the attack on the mayor of Tel-Aviv, I. Rokeakh. Such disruption was for the Revisionists the main object on the day of general protest.

Unfortunately, part of the guilt for this ruffianism falls upon the official leaders of the Histadruth,** who constantly try to conciliate the Revisionist camp of internal fascism.

In the negotiations, the Revisionists demanded that no red flags should appear in any of the demonstrations, no slogan that might give any expression to Left Zionism, but that only the blue-white banner should be borne and only the "Hatikvah" be sung. The representatives of the Histadruth in the National Council * and in the Jewish Agency yielded to this demand, and they, together with the reactionary-bourgeois Zionist representatives, ordered that no labor organizations should on that day raise the red flag. The Histadruth leaders also ordered that, if the Revisionists should attempt any actions, there should be no resistance and that clashes with the Revisionists should be avoided *at all cost.*

After their demands were accepted, the Revisionists, with characteristic demagogy, declared, at the eleventh hour, that they did not wish to march together with the beaten troops of Weizmann's camp, that they did not want "to perform any Purim-plays." They declared that they would protest in their own manner.

One must say that, inasmuch as these wild Revisionist youth wanted to show their influence, they did show their numerical inconsequence. Only a few hundred people, mostly youngsters of the most backward Eastern communities, participated in their demonstration. But they also showed that with their wild arrogance and unchecked hooliganism they could bring about bloodshed amongst Jews —with impunity!

The tremendous confusion of the Histadruth leaders has its effect upon the broad masses under their in-

* Jewish Agency—A body of Jewish leaders, Zionists and non-Zionists, recognized by the British mandate over Palestine as representing the Jewish people.—*The Editors.*

** Histadruth—Jewish Labor Federation of Palestine.—*The Editors.*

* National Council—An elective body speaking in the name of Jews of Palestine composed of representatives of various parties.—*The Editors.*

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fluence. Thus the many workers witnessing the behavior of the Revisionist hoodlums on the streets did not give them the answer they deserved.

In the meantime, the Revisionists won their demands. On the day of protest there were no red flags on the streets, although some workers, even from Zionist labor groupings, did not, as a result, participate in the general demonstrations.

On the day of protest, in spite of certain comical features, to be mentioned later, there was expressed a mood never before felt in Palestine. *The disappointment in England found its outlet!* Feelings of wrath and the humiliation of a deceived people were manifested.

By eight o'clock in the evening of May 17 all public amusement places, all movie houses, theatres and cafes were closed. The electric lights in the show windows of the cities were extinguished. The streets, wrapped in darkness, depressed even more the gloomy spirits of the people. The entire settlement listened with deep emotion to the radio broadcast. Afterwards, the masses of people who streamed into the streets, especially in Tel-Aviv, began reviling the British government and its principal figures —Chamberlain, Halifax and MacDonald—who were responsible for the burial of the Balfour Declaration. Never were heard such bitter and sharp words or such imprecations as were heaped in a veritable torrent upon the British swindlers and world-robbers by the Jews that night in Palestine.

The organized expression of protest took place the next day, during the afternoon of May 18. On the streets of the cities, Haifa, Jerusalem, and especially Tel-Aviv, there marched in wide rows many tens of thousands of Jews of all strata and ages. In Tel-Aviv alone, about fifty thousand people participated in the march.

Unfortunately, however, these demonstrations did not give expression to the hatred of the British government that actually burned in the hearts of the people and that was privately expressed in the sharpest terms. Those who arranged the street parades, the official leaders of the Agency and of the National Council, as well as the leaders of the Tel-Aviv municipality, evidently tried to show "delicacy" toward the governmental power in the country and in London. They had applied beforehand for a permit, and it seems that they had pledged themselves to be well behaved.

Thus, the big demonstration-parades were actually like funeral ceremonies. Not a sharp word throughout the march, not even one song of struggle, no placard against the government, against the British imperialist fakers. But there were many slogans taken from sentences in the Bible, in the Hagadah of Passover, and partly from prayers. One could have believed that it was a religious procession. In Jerusalem, as in Haifa, scrolls of the Torah were carried at the head of some parades. In Jerusalem the rabbis marched with the Zionist leader, Usischkin, at their head, carrying in their hands the scrolls of the Torah, unrolled at the sentence: "And this land I shall give unto thee." Before them, they carried a stand on which the Torah was being

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

read, and they also carried ram's horns, on which they blew. . . . One can hardly say that the British lion would get terribly frightened by such "weapons."

Generally, in all of the cities, also in Tel-Aviv, the rabbis marched at the head, followed by the Histadruth representatives and the entire people. But still, here and there, one could hear among the demonstrators single fierce outcries that rent the heart.

Generally, at the final points of gathering, one did hear a certain number of sharp speeches, something one was unaccustomed to hear from the mouths of Zionist speakers and leaders in regard to the British government. In Jerusalem, Chief Rabbi Herzog publicly tore up the "White Book," and Usischkin declared that the Jewish people had survived Torquemada of the Inquisition and the tsarist government and would also survive the present British rulers.

Usischkin also addressed the Arabs in a message that was not particularly sage. But the simple fact that a person like Usischkin did find it necessary to address a word to the Arabs shows the change that is now taking place in the camp of the Zionists. Usischkin said:

"To you, the Arab population of the country, we send our word in this difficult moment. Until now in the course of twenty years the British government has deceived *us* Jews. Now it announces ten years of cheating you. The British government takes everything away from us, but it will give nothing to you. We understand your position and your National movement, which you serve, but your conduct against us is bad. You have enough room in other neighboring countries. Then let us remain the owners of this country that belongs to us as an inheritance from our ancestors, and we shall remain good neighbors."

For a leader like Usischkin it should have been clear that the Palestine Arabs, who struggle with so many sacrifices for their rights in Palestine, will not, at a moment when they are seeing their struggle bring achievements, all of a sudden depart from Palestine into the deserts. It would have been much more logical if his address had advocated that both peoples should find a way for a common life in Palestine! But it would be too much to expect such a conclusion from Usischkin. Nevertheless, the mere fact that there is an understanding that one must begin to *talk to Arabs* will perhaps lead the Zionists to a still clearer comprehension of their status in Palestine.

Quite characteristic was the attitude of the Palestine government to the protest day of the Jewish settlement. It seems that the government authorities have decided to carry through the publication of the decree liquidating the Balfour Declaration as a "kiss of death." The organs of the administration called together the representatives of the leading organs of the Jewish settlement and told them in so many words: "We know and understand how excited you are over the 'White Book,' and we understand that you wish to express your protest by getting it off your chest. Well, why not, we have nothing against it, but only on one condition, that you let us know in advance against what and how you want to protest, and that you take upon yourselves the full *personal* responsibility that everything will be *in order*. It is understood that the government must be informed in

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

advance of everything you plan to do." Thus, the government officials "reasoned" with the Zionist representatives and offered them aid in calmly swallowing their bitter pill.

WEAKNESSES OF THE PROTEST

Consequently, if one wants to summarize the protest campaign, one must regard it as a huge failure for its organizers and for the Jewish settlement. First, the fact that the official Jewish representatives accepted the government's advice to request a permit and to notify it of the entire protest proceedings, to a great extent deprived the protest of its weight. Secondly, the Jewish organs that organized the general strike exempted in advance all the Jewish government officials from strike duty, and thus imposed a limit upon the scope of the activity of the Jewish settlement in general. True, the government would not have legalized the strike unless it remained within the limits of the purely Jewish enterprises. True, also, the government took signed pledges from its Jewish officials that if they did not report for work on the Jewish strike day they would be "released" from their positions. Nevertheless, that the government dared to put such demands to Jewish officials and to give warnings to Jewish representatives is explainable by the fact that, with the exception of a certain number of immigrant Jews, especially in the settlements of Emek, who are permeated with Zionist idealism, there are widely prevalent—among the officials in particular—strong tendencies toward careerism. The government was aware that it could demand from its employees signatures to no-strike pledges, and the Zionist leadership knew that it would be futile to appeal to them to strike! The strike day of the Jewish population on May 18 was felt only in purely Jewish enterprises (and even then not everywhere; in the rural sections, work was continued in some orchards). All the city business places, cafes, restaurants, ice cream stands, etc., were closed. But the railroads, the post offices, the telegraph stations, the courts, and the ports were active as usual. An entirely different form is assumed by an Arab strike, which *first of all* hits all the government enterprises and institutions. This shows the relative positions occupied by the Jews and the Arabs in the country. Hence, the Jewish day of protest was essentially a failure.

The requested legalization caused the parades to appear like funerals, notwithstanding the fact that large numbers of people participated. There was no battle-cry, no sharp word against those who had deceived this protesting mass; there was no placard with a slogan against the government. This had the reverse effect of restraining the mass storm, the urge for a tempestuous outbreak of protest.

Last and most important, there were no slogans, no pointing to a way out, no prospect for the day following the protest demonstration or for the future in general.

This conciliating attitude toward the government, this helplessness, this refusal to face reality and to look for the only possible way out through making peace with the Arab population enabled the Revisionist gangs to raise their heads. In spite of their small number, the Revisionists dared

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to attack the general demonstration in Tel-Aviv, to beat up several dozens of workers, and also to lay hands upon a number of the Histadruth activists (two contributors to the *Davar** were taken to the hospital; also the leader of the Left Poale-Zionists,** Erem). Thus encouraged, the Revisionists on several occasions staged their own adventurist demonstrations under the slogans: "Down with Weizmann!" "To Hell with the Workers!" and "Jabotinsky, Save Us!" after the fashion of the Nazi "Heil Hitler" and "Sieg Heil." Unrestrained, the Revisionists on the evening of that May 18 day of protest felt sufficiently sure of themselves to make an attack on the Brenner House (Histadruth Building) in Tel-Aviv and to shower stones on the workers who guarded the House.

Briefly, the day of protest passed with vast numbers of the Jewish masses gnashing their teeth in anger, but with an undermined will, with an unclear road taken by the official leaders of the settlement and of the Zionist movement. The government is aware of this, just as it is aware of the Revisionist plague in the settlement, and, therefore, it tolerates its hooliganism, which helps the government to split the Jewish settlement and thus to carry out its plans more easily.

PROGRAM OF COMMUNIST PARTY FOR UNITED ACTION WITH THE ARABS AGAINST THE FASCIST DANGER

The Communist Party of Palestine is working in the best way possible to serve the interests of the Jewish settlement through its endeavor to establish peaceful relations with the Arab population. At the present moment, the Palestinian Communist Party is devoting all of its energies toward calming the mutual anger of both peoples in the effort to direct their attention against the fascist menace from without and from within.

The attitude of the Communist Party of Palestine finds its expression in its published appeals, in its illegal press, as well as in all the organizations where its members and sympathizers are active.

In the Arab neighborhood, the Party points out that Hitler's and Mussolini's agents are now interested in aggravating the relations between Jews and Arabs in the country, and that, in spite of the incomplete realization of the Arab demands, there is no sense in furthering the revolt movement, because, in the present moment, the partial yielding and promises of the British government to carry out a gradual reform in the country constitute a certain accomplishment, which may ventually, under a proper political vigilance, lead further toward realization of the full right of self-administration. The Party points out that one has to consider the international situation, that the fascist agencies are far from being interested in improving the conditions of the Arab masses, but, on the contrary, are interested in crushing every movement for liberation and independence in all colonial lands, as one can learn from the example of Albania.

In the Jewish neighborhood, the Party calls for struggle against the adventurist appeals of the Revisionists, those under their influence, and other

* *Davar*—Daily organ of the Histadruth.—*The Editors.*

** *Poale Zion*—"Workers of Zion," Right-wing Socialists.—*The Editors.*

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Zionist groups who are seeking to organize armed revolts, which would result in the complete destruction of the Jewish settlement.

The Party points out that, for many years, it has warned the Jewish settlement not to rely on British imperialism and its promises, foretelling that under each changed situation the settlement would be betrayed and all promises forgotten. Now, with its "White Book," the Chamberlain government confirms the correctness of the Communists, and especially of the Palestine Party, in their warning that only in an understanding reached with the Arab people is there to be found a way out for the Jewish settlement, a prospect of a life of security and peace, and a partial solution to the problem of the refugees.

But the Communist Party does not wish to take advantage of this vindication of its position for narrow party purposes. The Palestine Communists, devoted to the interests of the Jewish settlement and to its advancement, demand the greatest vigilance in the interests of the settlement from all those who have their eyes open to reality. And that reality is a very bitter one: a wall of enmity between Jews and Arabs; open betrayal on the part of the British; an imminent danger of war with the fascist countries, a possibility of Italian attacks, especially of air-raids; and a very hard economic situation intensified by widespread unemployment. Therefore, the Communists appeal for the use of all possible means in the effort to reach an understanding with the Arabs. Although the Communist Party has its own perspective and program for the future shaping of the land, for the collaboration of both peoples, it does not at this moment put forward any program, but only one slogan: Unity, one united front of all those who see the necessity of reaching an agreement with the Arabs. Zionists and non-Zionists, those standing for a form of government built on a parity basis, those standing for the idea that the Jewish minority should reach 40 per cent of the population, and all others, the group of "Mapai" (Right Poale Zionists), adherents of Kaplansky, the Hashomer Hatzoir,* Poale Zion, Brith Sholom,** together with all those who understand now the urgency of an understanding with the Arabs, should together form one single front for common work to secure such an understanding.

Finally, the Communist Party, realizing the danger of Revisionism and its senseless attacks upon the Histadruth, as well as upon the Zionist organization, realizing that through such attacks the atmosphere can be poisoned with fascist venom, especially for the backward sections of the population, has decided to call upon all Communist followers and sympathizers to support the present leadership of the National Council and of the Jewish Agency with Weizmann at its head. The Communist Party declares that it does this, not because it considers Weizmann's course to be correct, but because the progressive workers cannot be indif-

* Hashomer Hatzoir (Young Guardians)—Left-wing group within the Zionist organization.—*The Editors.*

** Brith Sholom (Pact of Peace)—A group led by the president of the Jerusalem Hebrew University, Dr. J. L. Magnes, which stands for peace and understanding between Jews and Arabs.—*The Editors.*

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ferent to the fate of the settlement. Of course, a settlement under a progressive leadership would be better than under the leadership of Weizmann, but it is better to have Weizmann than Jabotinsky, because the Revisionists only want to draw the settlement into the entanglement of a bloody adventure.

In spite of the fact that it is necessary to direct sharp criticism against the leadership of the Histadruth, the Communist Party calls for defense of and devotion to the very existence of the Histadruth against the wild Revisionist attacks.

In this most trying moment, the Palestine Jewish Settlement can see more clearly who are its enemies and who its real friends.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE COMMUNIST PARTY IN THE STATE OF WASHINGTON AND THE 1940 ELECTIONS

BY MORRIS RAPPORT
Secretary, Northwest District, Communist Party, U.S.A.

THE events of the past several months in the Northwest have fully borne out the analysis presented by Comrade Browder at the May Plenum of the National Committee. These events have displayed a two-fold character. On the one hand, the progressive forces, looking forward to the 1940 elections, have sought to consolidate and extend the gains in the elections by developing and extending those organizations which contributed to the New Deal victories. On the other hand, the camp of reaction, disturbed and uneasy at the democratic advance of the people, has developed a desperate offensive against the New Deal forces. The main struggle has developed around the Washington State Legislature, which provided a dramatic arena, with the New Deal and progressive legislators waging the struggle for the people against the united camp of Republicans and reactionary Democrats.

The State legislature of Washington had hardly convened when the strategy of reaction became clear: A Senatorial spokesman of the reactionary Democrats advanced the idea of a "purge" of alleged Communist legislators. The cry of "Communist invasion" of the State Legislature was raised in the hope that this would drive the progressives into the camp of the reactionary Democrats. But the progressives, firm in their support and defense of the New Deal, did not capitulate to this red-baiting attack, and the miserable reactionary strategy failed. Nonetheless, the Martin Democrats and the Republicans (who were only too willing) quickly united in order to carry through the reactionary policies of the Governor.

This reactionary combination was, however, soon disturbed when a tremendous popular protest arose against the Governor's message which brazenly proclamed a wholesale attack in the fields of social security, education and taxation. Even the Governor's own machine began to crumble under rising public indignation. A new device was needed to distract attention from the Governor's starvation program and weaken the growing strength of the progressive legislators. Out came a bill by the Governor's floor leader for the establishment of a "Baby Dies Committee," directed not only at the alleged "Communists" in the Legislature but at the broad labor and progressive movement.

Thus, the combination of Repub-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

licans and reactionary Democrats made quite clear its goal. It aimed to destroy the labor unity which had been achieved during the election campaign and which had become a rallying center for the masses of the people in the struggles around the Legislature. Through red-baiting and witch-hunts they hoped to split the labor movement, to isolate it, and remove its united support from the New Deal legislators. This coalition hoped to discredit the New Dealers utterly as a disruptive force and thus shape public opinion for a reactionary victory in 1940.

The Republican Party, the main vehicle of reaction in the state, also had its own independent program, as events subsequently proved. First, to unite with the reactionary Democrats and insure passage of the Governor's starvation program, and then to place the full responsibility for that program on the *whole* Democratic Party, including the New Deal wing. With such discredit heaped upon the Democratic Party, and with the aid of the Martin Democrats, the Republicans hoped for their own party victory in 1940. It must be said that the reactionary Democrats were conscious and willing collaborators in this Republican plot.

However, the full reactionary program of the Governor and the Republicans was not achieved. The retreat of the Governor from his message and certain victories won by the New Deal forces were only due to the fact that the progressive camp *boldly pursued a policy of maintaining unity; it aroused the people to vigilance and organization; it exposed red-baiting and did not waver in the struggle.* The New Deal legislators refused to be isolated. They broadened their camp on specific issues, widened their own horizon, and on many occasions mustered votes for the success of their own strategy, thus disorganizing the reactionary bloc and threatening the Governor's control over the Legislature.

A joint lobby of the Grange, the A. F. of L. and C.I.O. unions, Railroad Brotherhoods, Commonwealth Federation, Tax Education League, and many other civic groups, was formed and functioned throughout the period of the legislative session. On the demand of the people, the progressive legislators organized a mass legislative conference at Olympia in which 2,000 representatives from all over the state participated. The progressive legislators regularly reported to their constituents on the week-ends. Series of local conferences were organized which constantly brought pressure on the reactionaries and support to the progressives.

Although the Governor's Social Security Department asserted privately that at least $70,000,000 was needed to care adequately for the people in the state, the Governor's budget, in the name of "liberalizing relief" and "economy," called for only $31,000,000. The final allotment, however, was substantially larger by $9,000,000. This can be attributed mainly to the activities of the progressive legislators and the united people's lobby which functioned all through the session. Likewise, the Baby Dies Committee proposal was killed, as well as many other vicious measures originally planned by the reactionary coalition.

A word must be said here on the activities of the Trotskyites, represented in the Legislature by one

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

woman member. She distinguished herself in her red-baiting and her wholehearted support of the reactionary coalition in its attempt to create strife in the labor organizations and among the progressive legislators. She demanded the investigation of "Communist activities" in the Federal Writers Project in Seattle and offered her support for the Baby Dies Committee proposal in exchange for her own pet bills. Her demands for the investigation of the alleged "Communist activities," however, met the same fate as the Baby Dies Committee.

The coalition of reactionary Democrats and Republicans was thus able to carry through much of its program through *machine control* and against the will of the mass of the people. Upon adjournment, reaction was confronted with the actual unfolding of its own program in the face of continued and growing unity in the democratic camp. The measures carried out in the Legislature worked serious hardships on the aged and unemployed, and affected the whole being of the state. Thus, the reactionaries were forced to concentrate ever-increasing efforts on destroying the greater unity welded during the legislative session and stifling the increasing popular resentment against the reactionary offensive.

A campaign against labor unity, creating labor strife, inaugurating vigorous red-baiting, and sowing all manner of confusion, was the line pursued by the reactionaries. In the labor movement they are centering their main attack on those unions that have stood in the forefront of labor unity, such as the lumber unions. In Grays Harbor, for example, demagogically raising the slogan of "open the factories," a semi-vigilante organization has been established for the purpose of breaking the strength of the unions. Jurisdictional disputes are being engineered in the canning and fishing industries, while the press has been mobilized to create confusion and disaffection of public opinion.

Another point of concentration is the social security front. Thousands of citizens are already feeling the full brunt of the Governor's program. The federal W.P.A. cuts are working tremendous hardships on the aged, the unemployed and W.P.A. workers, seriously affecting small business as well. Among the unemployed, as in the unions, reaction is making full use of the Trotskyites, who are trying to set up dual organizations, and by provocative action to disrupt the growing unity between the unemployed and the employed.

In the state of Oregon, where labor and the progressive movement are weaker and the labor movement was unable to unite during the last elections, the Republican Governor and Republican House and Senate, aided from the outside by the reactionary tory Democrats, have succeeded in unfolding a similar program for the people, with much less resistance.

As against this offensive, the labor and progressive movement continues its efforts to maintain and extend its unity. In Seattle, a Labor Coordinating Committee composed of C.I.O. and A. F. of L. unions was established to coordinate joint activities for labor unity. This committee continues to increase its affiliates, and engages in efforts to bring the Railroad Brotherhoods into this movement as an important unifying force. It has developed cooperation with the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

farm organizations and is extending its support to the activities of the middle class, the aged and the unemployed. *Throughout the Northwest, labor is cementing its ranks against disruption from within and from without and is waging its own counter-offensive against wage cuts and union-busting.* The small farmers are growing more conscious of their common interest with labor, and various conferences are being planned to discuss joint problems.

In the forefront of the struggle against the Governor's program is the Workers Alliance. In many instances, and often with united labor support, it organized "Governor Martin Starvation Camps" as the first step in dramatizing the serious plight of the people. These actions, having already served their purpose, are now passing into more advanced forms of struggles—picket lines, broad united front conferences, with the support of city and local officials, small business men, etc. Already civic groups from different cities are effecting a joint consultation and action committee against the Governor who, to make matters worse, is not even dispensing the meager funds allotted according to actual need, but on a month-by-month pro-rata basis.

In the struggle for peace, the Pacific Northwest, situated as it is, is especially conscious of the danger of Japanese aggression. It has an overwhelming sympathy for China and universal condemnation of Japanese invasion. Mass picket lines and demonstrations, unprecedented in the breadth of their support, have effectively stopped the shipment of scrap iron for days in the principal seaports and towns. In Astoria the Port Commission has officially barred scrap iron shipments. Out of these activities different types of organizations have grown to continue and coordinate all peace activities, providing a new reservoir of strength to the general progressive labor movement. The point of the struggle for peace and against fascism has been to arouse greater awareness of Japan's role as one of the fascist aggressors, and to gather support for the Thomas amendment. A high point in these activities was the successful International Conference in Vancouver, British Columbia, on April 23.

In several cities and towns May Day parades and demonstrations were held under central slogans of labor unity, social and national security, and with the participation of both C.I.O. and A. F. of L. unions. The Communist Party is especially intensifying its activities in connection with the results of the state legislative session and in preparation for 1940, to bring the farmers in the small towns nearer to the general progressive movement in the state. Thus, the key question today is to broaden and extend the unity, developed against all reactionary attempts to split and disrupt it in preparation for 1940.

II.

This, then, provides the picture of the general situation in which our Party in the Northwest District has worked and operated. It has conducted itself actively and energetically in defense of the needs of the people, in defense of democracy. As part of the democratic camp, its members have participated in the struggle against the reactionary offensive. As the vanguard champion of labor and

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

popular unity for social and national security, our Party, in collaboration with others, and often independently, has initiated broad popular movements which rallied large sections of the people.

The red-baiting attacks were met with a series of independent undertakings: statements, leaflets and neighborhood papers, Party meetings and radio broadcasts, etc. Our Party played a direct role in the defeat of the red-baiting resolutions in the Legislature, when it publicly submitted copies of its Constitution, reports and resolutions to every Representative and Senator. Our individual members worked tirelessly in all the struggles of the people, clarifying issues and answering the practical needs of leadership and activity in the various movements.

As a result, our Party has registered some measure of growth. In the last year we have grown by 60 per cent, on the basis of the comparative registration figures of 1938 and 1939. In many respects, however, this growth has been uneven, as is reflected first in the monthly rate of recruiting. The first four months of this year show the following: January, 213; February, 281; March, 142; April, 264. This unevenness is also found in dues payments and in disproportionate rates of recruiting. We have thus not fully developed our potential recruiting capacities.

Before proceeding to the question of registration, there are certain features in our Party growth which should be noted. The rapid growth of the Party has also brought a corresponding rising maturity of local Party leadership. It can be said that in some respects we have reached a stage where our local leading personnel is assuming an ever greater independent political character, capable of providing stable and mature leadership in each area. More and more it is able to tackle its problems independently and in a responsible fashion, with less reliance upon our higher committees, except for general, state and national line. This feature cannot be underestimated, since it is the key to the growth and maturity of our Party as a whole.

We have also experienced a growth in the small town and outlying areas. In one county alone, Snohomish County, Party organizations exist in no fewer than sixteen towns. Hitherto unreached by us, such areas offer an almost unlimited source of constant Party growth. Everywhere in such places we have found workers and small farmers extremely responsive to our Party's call. These areas are of no small political importance, being a vital link between the workers and the farmers, even as it is a concentration point of reaction for the building of anti-labor and semi-fascist organizations.

Another important feature is the headway made in building the Party in the agricultural areas. In Yakima Valley, heart of the farm country, our Party has far more than doubled its membership. Made up primarily of farmers, our Yakima organization has helped to initiate the organization of the small farmers, and is rapidly extending its membership and work throughout the valley.

Our total membership at the end of last year was 5,016, comprising 2,703 recruits during 1938; 72 per cent of this membership has been registered so far. How does this compare with

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the previous years? First, in recruiting; 1936 recruits totaled 1,032; 1937 recruits totaled 1,720. The registration in 1936 was 54 per cent; in 1937, 60 per cent. Our present membership to date stands at 4,479. In 1937, 74 per cent of the members were native-born; in 1938 80 per cent; and in 1939 82 per cent.

A detailed study of our registration figures reveals that the main loss occurs during the first two years of membership. For instance, of the 1,728 recruits in 1937, only 1,245, or 72 per cent were registered in 1938; and of these, only 626, or 36 per cent, registered in 1939. Of those with longer membership durations, fluctuation is minor, about 7 to 10 per cent.

Another important conclusion is that the fluctuation is greater in the larger cities. If the big cities had maintained the same ratio as the small places we would have reached approximately 82 to 85 per cent registration. How can we explain the fact that the smaller cities, which are more isolated, have weaker leadership and receive less attention from the higher committees, can stabilize and consolidate their organization better than the larger cities?

In answer to this question we can offer at least two conclusions: First, the smaller cities are faced directly with their community problems as a whole; they have no county or district offices to run to for solutions; they are obliged by their very circumstances to rely on and develop their own capabilities. Thus they learn faster to stand on their own feet and in turn they find the Party a better vehicle to solve their problems. Secondly, life in these smaller areas is neither as "fast" or as complex as in the large cities. The lower Party organization becomes in many respects the center of community activity, providing the membership with a many-sided, political, social, cultural life, while in the larger areas, despite our constant struggle against the practice, the political problems tend to be handled largely by the top committees.

Registration has also called to our attention a number of important problems. In many instances those that had been dropped from the Party rolls remained unaware of the fact. They had simply been away from branch meetings for one or another reason, in some cases confident in the knowledge that they were still Party members! It was evident that our branches were paying little attention to those absent from branch meetings, simply dropping them when they did not attend. Secondly, the section and county committees too easily accepted this policy of dropping without investigation, and conducted little or no struggle to prevent the loss of members. All this was facilitated by the circumstance that while branch books were put into shape at the beginning of the year, they were not constantly kept up to date, with resulting confusion, inaccuracies, negligence, and the loss of members. In the town of Raymond, for example, the branch reported fifteen dropped. The County Committee assigned a comrade, and in the process of investigation fourteen were registered and some $9 dues collected. These comrades were simply waiting for some one to contact them. In Spokane a similar situation existed when the local committee asserted that out of a list of 146 unregistered members there were only twenty names that were "worth while."

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

When that "theory" was set aside, twenty-three were immediately registered and to date from eighty to ninety more have come in!

Our experiences also raised some problems with regard to the non-attendance of so many members. Some comrades attribute this to careless and indiscriminate recruiting. Others maintain that the rapid current of events causes confusion, hesitation and wavering. Still others declare that non-attendance can be traced to the increasing attacks on our Party by the reactionaries, to red-baiting, terror, etc. Some comrades approach the question, on the other hand, as simply the neglect of organizational measures, like the failure of branches to check up on attendance. While all of these difficulties unquestionably play some role, it would be entirely incorrect to consider that we can thus explain away the problem of non-attendance and fluctuation. We must look elsewhere for fundamental reasons.

New members, upon joining the Party, are really conscious of the great obligation they have assumed. But this obligation presents itself immediately as required attendance at numerous meetings, endless conferences, heavy financial burdens and "conflicts" with their work in non-Party organizations. Because of our own weaknesses, and because they lack a sufficiently broad understanding of the role of the Party, many new members are overwhelmed by these obligations and leave. Many others refuse to join the Party out of fear that they will be obliged to neglect their duties, not only in their organizations, but at home as well.

Here again the problem cannot be solved through organizational changes in the branch or its inner life alone. More lively branch meetings, energetic branch programs, exciting educational discussions, relaxation of financial strain, better adjustment of branch size—all these can help. *But our problem is not simply organizational; it is political both in content and form.* While we are conducting a struggle to bring the member to the Party, the time has come to raise the slogan: *"Bring the Party to the Member!"*

It is often assumed, for example, that the many comrades who do not attend branch meetings are inactive, passive and not "proper" material for Party membership. But the contrary generally is true. Precisely because these "inactive" comrades are so actively tied up in mass work, they often lose sight of the role of the Party; some even come to the conclusion that they can function as better Communists by devoting little or no time to branch attendance. Furthermore, many of these comrades follow the general Party line through the press, general meetings and the Party leaders in their own organizations, and consider that they are regularly functioning Party members.

We must approach this problem as one confronting a rapidly growing mass Communist Party, an organization which will include in its membership hundreds of thousands.

While we constantly strive to attain higher and higher attendance at our branch organization meetings, we must nonetheless take into account the inescapable fact that a large percentage of our membership is not attending meetings "religiously." Furthermore, any mechanical tendencies

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to make such "religious" attendance a prerequisite for Party membership will only serve to hinder the growth of the Party and bring about losses in Party membership. We must recognize that along with the problem of increasing membership attendance we must more than ever concern ourselves with the problem of providing leadership for those who do *not* regularly attend branch meetings for one or another reason.

By the slogan "Bring the Party to the Member" we in no way relax our struggle to bring the member to the Party. On the contrary, a political understanding of the Party's responsibility to the member will bring more members than ever back to the Party. Many organizational forms must be developed along this particular line, such as the press, meetings, radio, visiting committees, etc. Obviously the work, for example, of a tactful, sympathetic visiting committee can do more than anything else, first, to maintain a live, friendly contact and eventually to bring about regular attendance. Such a committee can provide the comrade with literature, highlights of political activities, warmth and comradely friendship. A political understanding of this problem will do away with tactlessness, antagonisms, callous disregard of financial difficulties, etc.

In this fashion, the Party will also be able to increase its fighting role, and its capacity for activity and growth, by increasing the number of members at its disposal above the general level of the regular attendance, which in turn stands to be increased.

Comrade Browder's speech in Boston on the question of religion is already materially aiding in the solution of what has developed as an important problem in our branches. No doubt many other Party organizations are meeting our own experience of large numbers of religious people coming into our Party. Comrade Browder's remarks showed fully the whole basis upon which these people can come to our Party. Yet during the course of our registration work, we found quite a number of religious workers leaving our Party because of unclarity, not only on their part but on the part of our local organizations as well. It is clear that not only must we intensify our efforts to present accurately the position of the Party to the religious non-Party masses, but we must also undertake the clarification of our Party membership itself, so that religious people will find a home in the Party, which is not at all incompatible with their church activities.

Party education has already reflected itself in the growth and stabilization of our Party. Last year we had 135 members attending section training schools. This year we have increased the number to 256, to which we can also add 124 who have attended full-time county training schools, of which there were none the previous year. To these should be added the thirty-two students of the six-week full-time District Training School. Mention should also be made of the more or less permanent Workers School in Seattle which completed its first term last year with an attendance of some 150 students, and by now has completed its second successful term.

This increase in organized educational activity is manifesting itself in a noticeable rise in the political level and theoretical work of our Party.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A new feature, week-end schools throughout the district, was introduced last fall. Hundreds of comrades have already passed through these brief schools which deal with current as well as more basic questions. Still, this general program is not yet sufficiently regular and systematic. The appearance of the *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union* here, as everywhere else, has already proved a weapon of inestimable value in ideologically arming the Party and rousing unprecedented interest and concern with questions of Marxist-Leninist theory. Elaborate plans are already under way involving the Party in the study of the book, which has helped tremendously in placing in the center of our educational work the key question of independent application and self-study, and at the same time has strengthened our whole Party-building campaign.

This brings us now to some summary conclusions about branch organization and some perspectives. In our district it is no longer sufficient to place the problem of the branch in such a way as simply to insist on branch activity in the neighborhood or community. The majority of our branches are already actively engaged in every field of neighborhood work—in the political organizations, the trade unions, civic and community undertakings, churches, etc. For us, the key problem is now two-fold: First, to discover the best methods of Party work under these conditions; and second, how tactfully and modestly to bring forward acknowledged representatives of our Party who will make the community openly aware of the existence of the Party. Such Party representatives can win the respect of other local leaders in their own neighborhoods and also do much to make the reactionary campaigns against our Party ineffective.

As to methods of Party work, as well as Party organization, these will vary from place to place according to specific circumstances. Above all, we must stress *flexibility and informality of work.* The very circumstances in which we find ourselves require Party organizations which can readjust themselves rapidly to each new situation politically and organizationally. Nor is this simply a question of mechanical organizational changes. There are large branches that function splendidly (for example, the Longshore branch of seventy-five members in Portland) and large branches (as in Spokane) which do not and will not function well. The solution lies in the recognition of the political problems involved, with the necessary changes being made accordingly. *The struggle against formalism must be placed in the center of all our activity.*

III.

Preparations for the twentieth anniversary of our Party take place amidst the general celebration of the fiftieth anniversary of the founding of the State of Washington. Our Party, led by Comrade Browder, which has undertaken the task of rediscovering and reinterpreting the history of our country and the State of Washington, dedicates its observance of these great anniversaries to the deepening of our knowledge of our state and our people, to arming and inspiring them in the struggle against present-day reaction.

It was Thomas Jefferson who sent

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Lewis and Clark on the expedition which blazed the path to the founding of our state. Jefferson was accused by the reactionaries of his day of destroying life and property when he sent the expedition, in the same manner that President Roosevelt is attacked by the reactionaries of today.

The spirit of Jefferson has been borne high by the people of Washington State, producing men like John R. Rogers, the first Populist elected Governor in the United States. In 1920 the State of Washington cast the highest vote for the Presidential candidate of the Farmer-Labor Party of that time. In 1924, the Farmer-Labor Party gave LaFollette more votes than the candidates of the major parties. It was in Seattle that the first general strike in our country's history took place. Here it was also that the first Soldiers' and Sailors' Councils were organized, and where longshoremen stopped the *SS. Delight* from sailing with its cargo of munitions destined for the counter-revolutionary Kolchak army, an action which contributed to the victory of the October Revolution.

It was in the Northwest that the great free speech fights of the I.W.W. occurred, and the great struggles against the lumber barons took place. It was here that the shameful massacres of Everett and Centralia took place. It was here that the greatest self-help movement in the country developed, and it was in the city of Seattle that the unemployed captured the County-City Building in 1933.

Our Party is inseparably connected with the struggles of the people of our state just as it was the socialist revolution led by Lenin and Stalin which inspired the organization of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Councils and the general strike in Seattle. It was Comrade Foster who directly participated in, and provided leadership to, the development of the working class movement in the Northwest. It was the growth and maturing of our Party that contributed to the Farmer-Labor Party in 1924; it was our Party which aroused the masses to the effects of the 1929 crisis.

In this, the year of the twentieth anniversary of our Party and the fiftieth anniversary of the State of Washington, our district soberly prepares for the decisive elections of 1940. To assure the defeat of reaction in 1940 our Party will not only continue and intensify its efforts to effect the unity of the labor movement, and consolidate and extend the advancing progressive movement, but it will place particular emphasis on work in the small town areas and among the farm population. In the consolidation and increased tempo of growth of our Party, we recognize the best assurance for the carrying forward of the traditional progressivism of the people of the Northwest. The people of Washington and the Northwest will add new pages to their history of progress as they march forward to prepare for victory in 1940.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MONETARY REFORM AND THE DEMOCRATIC FRONT

SOME LESSONS FROM CANADIAN EXPERIENCE

BY LESLIE MORRIS

Social movements for the reform of the capitalist monetary system are playing a big part in the development of resistance to capitalist monopoly in North America. At times these movements take the form of vague demands for "cheap money," or for "dividends," or pensions in the form of state payments each Thursday. Such expressions of anti-monopoly feeling, no matter how unscientific and illusory, nevertheless spring from the demand of the small producers and petty manufacturers for surcease from the grinding oppression of the bourgeois banking system, which section of capitalist monopoly is the central target of such movements.

Even a superficial study of these monetary reform movements reveals that they spring almost exclusively from the non-proletarian sections of the population who are enslaved by monopoly: the farmers, small merchants and even sections of the proletarians who are, in the rural communities, under the ideological influence of middle class democrats. The Non-Partisan League in the Northwest of the United States, the Bryan silver movement, the Greenback campaign, the California "$30 every Thursday" electoral fight last year, the Townsend pension plan and Social Credit all have been political expressions of monetary reform in one degree or another.

All these movements have one thing in common: they look for the basic solution through reforms in the system of the distribution of commodities, failing to see, as the Marxist does, that the process of capitalist production gives rise to the evils of the present system. Hence, the demand for "government control of credit," the removal from the banks of the right to issue currency, the equalizing of production and distribution on the theory that only in this way can surplus commodities be consumed and business improved, the establishment of state credit houses to issue in the form of scrip available to all citizens that amout of purchasing power equal to the sum of surplus commodities on hand.

In one North American governmental area such a monetary reform theory is the officially-stated policy of a government: the Social Credit ad-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ministration of Premier William Aberhart in the Canadian western province of Alberta. A resume of Alberta's experiences, and the position this government occupies in relation to the labor movement particularly, will be of interest.

* * *

Alberta is the Canadian province due north of Montana. It is primarily agricultural, but possesses important coal-mining, oil and meat-packing industries. Its population is formed from those pioneers who stopped at the Rockies during the great westward migration in the days of free homestead land, and settled in the great ranching country among the foothills. Of a population (1936) of 772,782 (which includes many settlers from the midwestern United States) about 63 per cent is to be found in rural communities. Wheat and cattle are the main products of the province.

Its economic history is that of the North American West. World overproduction of wheat and cattle in the crisis years and the drastic decline of urban purchasing power brought catastrophe to the province. A total production of over $400,000,000 in 1929 dropped to $206,000,000 in 1933. Secured public and private debts increased alarmingly, forcing farmers and ranchers out of production into the cities, bringing on forced collections and sharply curtailing governed income and expenditures.

Natural calamity added to the misery of the people. With the exception of the past and present crop years, each year of the crisis has been one of drought in the southern portions of the province.

In short, Alberta is suffering from an agrarian crisis which has been aggravated by the industrial crisis and which in turn deepens the industrial crisis. The criminal methods of land settlement, the pyramiding of debt, the downward plunge of the world wheat price, unemployment—all made worse by the absence of federal ameliorative powers under the existing Canadian constitution—caused a highly inflammable social situation which had, naturally, tremendous political consequences.

With the agrarian crisis came a heightened realization of the way in which industry is exploiting agriculture. Unbelievably punitive freight rates, industrial monopolies which actually increased the prices of their products and their profits during the crisis, rising indebtedness to the industrial and financial East, governmental bankruptcy—all became targets for the hatred of the people. They had known of this double exploitation in the past; in the years of the crisis they came to realize it as never before.

The government of the province since its formation in 1905 had been free-trade Liberal up to 1921. In that year the farmers' economic organization, the United Farmers of Alberta, went into politics and captured the government. Political opportunism aggravated by the pre-crisis agricultural expansion and the practice of capitalist party methods made the government ineffective. When the crisis came it tried to place the burden on the backs of the people instead of carrying out its mandate of struggle against the monopolists in the interests of the primary producers.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Then a political upheaval occurred which may conceivably be duplicated in varying forms in other regions, particularly those which are predominantly agricultural, where the labor movement embraces only a small minority of the population and where socialist understanding is consequently low. It is necessary to study Alberta precisely for the reason that in the agricultural regions of North America the imperative alliance between worker and farmer is still weak and that as yet Communist Party influence is small. When we see the growth of Republican influence in the last U. S. elections and realize that agricultural individualism has demands specifically its own and including the cry for credit reform and "cheaper money" to "gain something" at the expense of the big shots (of which reactionary old line party demagogues are quick to take advantage) the necessity for a positive approach to middle class monetary reform movements becomes apparent. Sectarianism here on the part of the labor movement may well enable monopolies to create a fascist base among the farmers.

* * *

In August, 1935, the Alberta elections took place, on the eve of the federal election which swept the Tories out of office and elected the present Liberal administration. The farmers' government of Alberta was totally discredited. The free-trade Liberals in the province were unable to hold their own in a period of mad economic nationalism and the world overproduction of wheat and cattle. The Cooperative Commonwealth Federation (the Canadian Socialist Party) was pursuing a policy of "socialism or nothing." The Communist Party was at the moment quite distant from the immediate demands of the people, which were: relief from debt, assistance to continue production, increased purchasing power, lower consumers' prices, a lower cost of living, government action and leadership to save the province from utter ruin within the framework of capitalism.

Here is where Social Credit stepped in.

For some time prior to election day, William Aberhart, a Fundamentalist Calgary high school principal and Baptist minister, had been espousing the cause of Social Credit. An able speaker and the first Canadian public figure really to make of the radio a tremendous political weapon, he advanced the slogan of "twenty-five dollars a month for each Alberta citizen over eighteen years," payable through a system of state credit houses which would remove from the chartered banks their control of credit and assume the right to issue currency "against public credit," in short, against "goods and services."

While not an orthodox Douglas Social Crediter (Douglas's relations with Aberhart have always been shaky) Aberhart's ability to put over his crusade for "increased purchasing power and a lower cost to live," coming at a time when no other party expressed so vividly the deep resentment of the voters against monopoly capital, won the election, to the consternation of the big shots and their parties and to the surprise of the Social Crediters themselves.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Douglas theory of Social Credit (there are several offshoots, but England's Major Douglas is the "orthodox" leader) starts from the viewpoint that there is never sufficient money in circulation, or credit available, to enable the consumers to purchase the totality of production in every given production-distribution cycle.

A complicated theory, it advances the argument that the "state" is the rightful authority to issue money and to organize credit, and that the private banks have usurped this normally governmental function. It is proposed, therefore, that all credit and monetary powers shall be invested in the hands of the government, which shall issue "basic dividends" to all bona-fide citizens in the form of governmental scrip, the amount of which is to be determined by the buying power needed to purchase all goods and services produced by society.

Social Credit does not deny private property, attributes to the state a benevolent, neutral function, and as a political movement derides political parties and depends upon economic "engineers" to run the economy of the country.

While Mr. Aberhart and his colleagues professed this point of view, and as a result promised a "basic dividend" in the form of state scrip to increase purchasing power once private control of credit was broken, his policy, faced with the grim facts of monopoly control and the profit system, and confronted with the determination of the electorate to get something tangible, has tended constantly in the direction of economic and social reform far removed from Social Credit theory. In other words, in practice he has to quite a degree seen the need for struggle on immediate issues as paramount.

An element of demagogy entered into this Social Credit landslide which elected 59 members of a legislature of 64 and then went on to capture the seats of the old-line parties and the farm and labor movements in the federal elections two months later, to the extent of electing 17 Alberta members of the federal parliament as against the labor group's six for the Dominion as a whole.

Aberhart was never explicit as to how he was going to pay the "basic dividend" of $25 monthly. He did and still does most eloquently berate the trusts and "financial racketeers" and while not indulging in red-baiting did make it quite clear that he was opposed to socialism. On a number of subsequent occasions he has shown his willingness to cooperate with labor, although the bitter sectarian attitude of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation makes this most difficult of achievement.

The $25 "basic dividend" has not been paid, although Aberhart has been in office from August, 1935, to this day. But to see in the Aberhart government a body of visionaries who won the election solely by advancing utopian panaceas and then welshed on their promises, is to commit a most grievous error and to help to drive this movement into the arms of reaction.

It is almost a miracle that the Aberhart government has not gone further to the Right, lacking as it does scientific theory as a practical guide, which only a Marxist-Leninist conviction can provide. This fact is better

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

understood when one considers that the capitalist parties, the press and the financial institutions of the country have spared no effort to misrepresent, sabotage, revile and destroy the Aberhart government. In this they have been objectively aided (despite the most touching professions of adherence to "socialism") by the leadership of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation, who, in their press, on their platforms and during election campaigns in which they deliberately split the vote despite the possibility of getting Social Credit to cooperate to defeat the reactionary candidates, have been in almost complete harmony with the chief capitalist opponents of the Alberta government.

In 1935 the Communist Party of Canada made the serious error of calling Aberhart a fascist. It rapidly corrected this mistake and publicly criticized this serious error, which arose from the sectarianism of the Party and its failure to grasp the many-sided nature of the rising people's movements.

The Communists since that time have steadily urged on the labor and progressive movement the need of cooperation with the Social Credit people. They have shown in practice the deepest sympathy with the basic Social Credit aim of increased purchasing power, debt relief, cheaper credit and a lower cost of living, at the same time stating quite clearly that adherence to the impractical and unworkable Social Credit theory can only confuse the issue and court disaster.

The Communist Party, both in conference with the Social Credit leaders and publicly, has urged upon the government those practical measures which are within its limited provincial and fiscal powers, to ease the lot of the people.

The government, after a year of hopeless Social Credit experiment, has shown a marked and increasing tendency to become a practical government with a progressive legislative policy.

For the sake of brevity let me list the main achievements and failures of this government:

1. Every act it has passed for increased taxation of the banks, debt relief, the mobilization of credit under government authority, and so on, has been declared *ultra vires* (beyond the authority) of the province as laid down in the federal constitution —while the infamous Quebec Padlock Act, which is patently *ultra vires* (as some of Aberhart's acts were not) has not been disallowed but has been permitted to pass into law.

2. Every possible means of private and public pressure has been brought to bear by monopoly capital to destroy the Alberta government; yet today it is conceded even by its most bitter enemies to be certain of reelection should it now go to the polls

3. The government sticks. It has been moving more and more to a point where it expresses the larger democratic aims of the people, while it is held back by a sectarian devotion to certain Social Credit principles (such as a frivolous attitude to taxation of the monopolies, etc.) and does not sufficiently explore the possibilities of revising the taxation structure of the province to provide funds for public works and lifting the burden of taxation on the producers. This,

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

on the official plea that it is "against all taxation." Nevertheless, its administrative policy is generally progressive. It stubbornly refuses to pay interest on its bonded indebtedness and each year renews moratoria on large sums of farm debt.

4. Importantly enough, the government still insists that if it were given a chance to control credit it could stimulate production and reduce living costs. In this it is receiving a great deal of support.

5. It is now trying to find a way to operate some consumers' goods industries under government control and has established a provincial system of credit houses where rebates are given to consumers who purchase certain quantities of Alberta-made goods.

There are profound lessons to be drawn from Alberta, not only for Canada, but for the continent.

It would be the gravest error to use the term "socially reactionary" in connection with such a movement, as has been done by some labor and progressive journals. It is just as wrong to hold up socialism as the only practical and immediate alternative for such a government.

It is precisely such attitudes which have continued the division between the main stream of the labor movement and the Social Credit movement, as I have indicated above.

The fact is that the Social Credit government has been able to hold on because it sticks to its central demand, "increased purchasing" power, representing as it does the interests of small producers who make up the vast majority of the population.

This basic demand, while it is partially met by the labor and farm movements' platform for a guaranteed minimum price for farm products, debt relief and tax reform, puts forward a tenacious agitation for "cheaper money" and a policy which will break the credit stranglehold of the big shots. It constantly emphasizes the need for a government banking system and an end to the private banking monopoly.

Such a stubborn demand of masses of people must not be lightly dismissed, particularly in states and provinces which are largely agrarian and lack any large resident bourgeoisie.

For it is precisely in the matter of credit reform that the Social Credit movement stands in need of assistance from the labor movement, which up to now has not sufficiently concerned itself with the *problem of increased purchasing power as it affects the petty producers—who have relations with the credit system not possessed by proletarians and which has advanced little argument in favor of democratized, nationalized banking and credit system.*

This is the stage which has been now reached in Alberta. Unless this specific assistance is forthcoming, it is possible, though by no means probable, that the big democratic sentiment which broke the old-line parties will be led up false avenues by reactionary demagogues, some of whom will undoubtedly arise from within the Social Credit leadership.

This is a big tactical problem, and one that will not be met by counterposing the demands of the labor movement and specifically of its progressive wing—to those of the monetary reform masses, who are just those

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"natural allies" of the labor movement (farmers, storekeepers and small traders) without whose cooperation with labor a democratic front is not possible. It is a problem of the alliance between the proletariat and the farmers, which must be approached in the same specifically North American way as the *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks)* describes so brilliantly in the case of the Russian Bolsheviks.

The big job is to close the gap between such mass movements and the labor movement, by adopting a thoroughly positive attitude, refraining from a "propaganda" approach and sectarian criticism, and seeking out those points on which agreement can be found, such as redistribution of the national income, credit reform, measures to stimulate the home market.

Surely, a really progressive government, this side of socialism, can and will mobilize the credit resources of the country through the creation of public works to make possible an increase of purchasing power and the consequent stimulation of production through government works without precipitating inflation. The actions of the New Zealand government, as described in the *Labour Monthly* (London) for last November, offer some lessons for us in this respect.

There certainly are dangers that the direction of this petty-bourgeois monetary reform movement will be contrary to the *real* interests of the small producer, and that it will fall prey to unscrupulous demagogues. But these dangers become immeasurably greater, to the point of the possibility of a fascist "credit-reform" movement, if the labor movement fails to take up in earnest the need for increasing purchasing power as the petty producers see it—by government interference in the credit monopoly of finance capital.

Social Credit is not confined to Alberta, but has succeeded in becoming the third largest party group in the Dominion Parliament and in having members elected to the provincial houses of two other provinces. This indicates that its appeal is an expression of a widespread desire among the agricultural producers for credit reform.

Time and again the revolt of the North American farmers has taken on the form of criticism of the monetary and credit system. And in view of the recurring and tenacious nature of such movements and their petty-producer, monetary reform, "share the wealth," "basic dividend," "ham and eggs," "pensions" demands, they cannot be dismissed as "crackpot" or "socially reactionary."

In Canada during recent weeks, the Social Credit government has been to the fore in supporting the national New Democracy movement, which has arisen as the "New Deal" bourgeois reform vehicle on the eve of the federal elections. Social Credit belongs in Canada to the forces of the democratic front. It is significant, too, that monetary reform proposals play a prominent part in the rising reform movement under New Democracy's leadership—and that it also is being considered for inclusion in the demagogic program of capitalist reaction.

All the more reason, then, for the labor movement to reach a common understanding with the middle class supporters of plans calling for relief

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

from debt and the monopoly of credit, although these plans may still be shot through with petty-bourgeois Utopianism.

In the fires of experience, and aided by the labor movement, they will come to see that the root of the trouble lies in capitalist production relations, and not in the sphere of credit. But should this Marxist-Leninist truth serve to obscure the need for a flexible, sympathetic attitude to monetary reform and agrarian cheap credit movements, then the very essence of Marxism-Leninism will be subverted.

Alberta remains as a constant reminder of the peculiarities that characterize the rise of the North American democratic front, which will undoubtedly assume forms we cannot at present predict, and for which the Communists must always be on the alert.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NOTES ON LATIN AMERICAN HISTORY

SOME LESSONS ON HOW NOT TO WRITE HISTORY

BY SAMUEL PUTNAM

THE history of the score of nations that constitute our hemisphere neighbors to the south—whom, under the leadership of President Roosevelt and the New Deal, we would have as "good neighbors"—is, by its very scope and intricacy, a formidable task for student or reader to approach. What, then, must be the difficulty of writing it, and above all, of compressing the huge mass of frequently conflicting data into a single volume? Yet there can be no doubt that, especially in these post-Munich and post-Lima days, a convenient and readable manual of the subject is highly desirable, and indeed a necessity.

Beginning with T. C. Dawson's two-volume work, *The South American Republics,* in 1904, there has not been precisely a dearth of Latin American histories. C. E. Akers' *A History of South America* was published in London, also in 1904. Nearly two decades later, in 1923, came H. G. James and P. A. Martin's *The Republics of Latin America,* followed in 1931 by A. C. Wilgus' *A History of Hispanic America* and W. S. Robertson's *History of the Latin American Nations.* In 1933, T. F. Rippy gave us his *Historical Evolution of Hispanic America.* If to this list we add the work by F. García Calderón, *Latin America, Its Rise and Progress,* published in English translation, at London, in 1913, we have just about the complete list of authoritative treatises, covering the entire field, that are available in English. And now comes F. A. Kirkpatrick, a Spanish scholar of the University of Cambridge, with *Latin America, A Brief History.**

In many respects the last-mentioned volume comes the nearest of all to satisfying the need for a popular manual. While quite as scholarly as its predecessors, it possesses the advantage of extreme and well-managed compression plus a simple and readable style, with a gratifying restraint as to footnotes, and convenient chapter-end bibliographies, grouped by subject, for those who would read further. Wisely eliminating all pre-Colombian archaeology and anthropology, and reducing to a minimum the story of the Spanish and Portuguese conquest, a good part of which he has told in a previous volume,** the author devotes the bulk of his book to the struggle for independence on the part of the various Latin

* Published by Macmillan, 1939, the Cambridge Historical Series.

** *The Spanish Conquistadores,* by F. A. Kirkpatrick.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

American countries, and brings their modern history down to the Buenos Aires Peace Conference of December, 1936.* By stopping where he does, he is forced to leave out most of the extremely interesting developments of the past two years (1937, 1938-39), which in Brazil, Chile, Mexico, Cuba and elsewhere have radically altered the concrete historical situation of today; not to speak of the rapid growth of fascist aggression in Latin America in the course of these two years, on the one hand, or the important evolvement of the Roosevelt Good Neighbor policy on the other hand, movements affecting the destiny of the two Americas. But we do at least have here, in readily portable and accessible form, the general historical background; and perhaps, after all, we should be grateful that an academic historian should deign to come, treading timorously, within two years of the present time.

Mr. Kirkpatrick's book, then, has its uses. But, as we shall see, it is by no means one to be taken without the proverbial grain of salt—and no mere grain, but a good, generous shaking, of the Marxian brand. In this respect the present writer must confess to an error of expression which he made, in penning a brief notice of the volume for the *Book Union Bulletin*, where he spoke of the author as exhibiting "a liberal point of view, tempered by a high degree of academic caution." The statement, possibly, might stand, if it were amended to read: "a liberal point of view, tempered by a high degree of academic caution, which not infrequently leads him (the author) into downright reactionary attitudes and conclusions or semi-conclusions."

There is, however, something more than academic caution involved. There is, on the part of this British historian of the Latin American nations, a certain deep-seated lack of faith in democracy and democratic processes which tends perilously in the direction of Chamberlainism—a tendency to accept an existing situation (*e.g.*, the Benavides dictatorship in Peru) for the simple reason that it is "historical"—in other words, what is, is right. When this is coupled with an inordinate respect for bourgeois "order" at any price, even though established by bloody and terroristic methods, and for the "reforms" instituted by dictators, we come dangerously near to the "he made the trains run on time" justification of Mussolini.

IS HISTORY "BIZARRE"? THE MEANING OF "REVOLUTION" AND THE STRUGGLE FOR DEMOCRACY IN LATIN AMERICA

The more one reads of modern historians these days, the more convinced one grows that the writing of history is a quite impossible task for any but the Marxist, equipped with the tremendous, invaluable tool of historical materialism. In connection with the history of our own country, we have had the opportunity to see what happens to a liberal historian like Professor Charles A. Beard, when, with the best of intentions but with no better implement than that of a mechanistic economic determinism, he turns his attention to the post-Revolutionary period. Failing to give the historic picture in all its dialectical

* The author occasionally goes beyond this date.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

richness and fullness of evolving, inter-struggling class forces, his false approach as a historian now has led him into a politically reactionary position of defeatism in the face of fascist world aggression.

Take the case of Mr. Kirkpatrick, a specialist of the study. He, in more ways than one, is typical. Fundamentally typical is the way in which he stands in something like timorous amazement before what he calls (p. 84) "the bizarre character which pervades Latin American history." Now, just what does this word "bizarre" mean, anyway—what can it mean—in the mouth of a historian? Should we expect, for instance, to hear it from the biologist in his laboratory or the astronomer before his mathematical tables? True, in the history of mankind, of society, there enters the *creative* element of the human subject (we will not forget our Marx, of the *Theses on Feuerbach,* the creative *interaction* of man and his environment). The word "bizarre," however, seems to imply a preconceived pattern of judgment; and this points, essentially, to an approach based upon philosophic idealism.

The bourgeois historian has come to expect man to behave in such and such a way, or ways; man's behavior, for him, has gradually been crystallized, not to say petrified, in certain categories, which are for the most part bourgeois-European. The history of the southern continent of the Western Hemisphere continues for them to be "bizarre."

A reflection of this basic error of approach on the part of the historian is to be found in the widespread popular impression that is summed up in the phrase, "South American revolution," especially as applied to Mexico, in which case the great peasant revolutionists like Zapata and Villa remain for them nothing but "bandits" —an impression which the Wall Street oil interests and their allies are careful to cultivate.

In other words, Latin American history is primarily melodramatic, when not a comic opera affair. Mr. Kirkpatrick is too scholarly to lend any support to this impression; and he performs a service by pointing out that it has been in good part due to a mistranslation of the Spanish term, *revolución,* which in Latin America at any rate is not commonly equivalent to our "revolution."

> "Usually *revolucion* does not mean constitutional change or alteration in form of government; it need not mean even change in methods of administration, but merely an attempt, whether successful or not, to replace rulers. Thus any seditious movement from a sanguinary civil war to the *pronunciamento* of a battalion is called *revolucion.* A bloodless *coup d'etat* leading to the resignation of a president and the installation of a provisional successor is so styled. Thus the reputation of Latin America for chronic 'revolutions' is partly due to mistranslation or misuse of terms."

On the other hand, as is indicated by what is, all in all, the best section of his book, the one on Mexico, Mr. Kirkpatrick appears to realize—without stating it in so many words—that what is happening to our nearest southern neighbor, under President Cardenas, and what has been happening to her since the great peasant leader Zapata took the lead in 1911, is a revolution in the real, revolutionary sense of the word—a strug-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

gle of the people against feudalism and foreign imperialist domination, in which the workers and the peasantry play an increasingly important role, participating in power with the national-revolutionary bourgeoisie.

While stressing the agrarian element, an extremely important one, Mr. Kirkpatrick is inclined to overlook the role of the Mexican proletariat, and this it is which prevents his seeing the advanced character of the Mexican revolution, the advanced plane upon which it is taking place, and which makes it possible for him (if we are to judge by a quotation which he here, as frequently, cannily employs) to view the entire revolutionary struggle in a country emerging from four centuries of feudal and foreign enslavement as an "extremely interesting . . . experiment . . . a 'totalitarian' State as much as Mussolini's or Hitler's, but with strong leaning toward the workers . . . also, to a certain extent, anti-foreign and anti-capitalistic." Thus does the ideological muddlement of the historian who refuses to see the class struggle as a determining force, go around in a vicious circle.

A refreshing contrast to this attitude is afforded by Henry Bamford Parkes in his excellent *History of Mexico,* published not long ago.* Dr. Parkes is a historian whose approach is essentially, although not consistently, that of the historical materialist; that is to say, he sees the interplay of class forces as the motivating factor throughout: first the struggle of the *Gachupines,** or Spanish-born official and merchant class, with the Creoles, or native-born white population; then the rise of a Creole aristocracy, which in turn struggled with the Mestizos or "half-breeds"; the rise of the Mestizos to power and influence; and finally, with Zapata, the definite rise of the modern Indian-peasant-agrarian movement, whose roots go back to the early nineteenth century, to the times of Hidalgo and Morelos. The point to be noted is that all of these racial divisions represented economic-class divisions, and the struggles between them were economic and class struggles.

ADVANTAGES OF THE DIALECTICAL METHOD; ERRORS OF THE NON-DIALECTICAL HISTORIAN

A historian like Dr. Parkes, in brief, even though he may not be a thoroughgoing Marxist,** by his perception of the dialectical movement of societies and the meaning of the class struggle, possesses a *center of reference* which the others lack. He, for one thing, is not likely to mistake a democratic government supported by a Popular Front alliance of the workers, peasants and national-revolutionary bourgeoisie for a form of the "totalitarian" state on the one hand or for a "Communist" state on the other. He will mistake neither the "anti-capitalistic" nor the "anti-foreign" elements involved, but will

* *A History of Mexico,* by Henry Bamford Parkes, Houghton-Mifflin Company, 1938. For a review of Parkes, by the present writer, see *New Masses,* October 11, 1938, p. 26.

* The name means "wearers of spurs"; it was applied to the Spanish-born officialdom and merchant class by the Creoles.

** It is chiefly in discussing the cultural-esthetic aspects of Mexican life, the significance of racial traits, and the like, that Dr. Parkes is inclined to lapse from the materialist standpoint, into some of the numerous mysticisms so sedulously fostered by Hispanic ideologists.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

rather see these for what they are, as deep-seated historic reactions to the yoke of foreign imperialism and foreign finance capital.

But let us return, now, to Mr. Kirkpatrick, who, because he does not possess such a center of reference, in the class struggle, sees Latin American history as "bizarre." We have another example of this historian's resulting failure to grasp the true significance of events—which occasionally leads him into a positive historical inaccuracy—in his treatment of the Brazilian uprising of 1935 and Vargas' subsequent seizure of dictatorial power. It is true, he sees clearly enough to be able to state that "The revolts of 1935 were not wholly, probably not mainly, communist" (an instance of that "academic caution" which has been mentioned). But what he does not see—what he fails absolutely to perceive—is the vast, widespread, organized and potentially powerful popular movement behind the revolt, represented by the embryonic people's front as embodied in the National Liberation Alliance. Once again, a glaring omission: Mr. Kirkpatrick does not even mention the National Liberation Alliance!

"How do they do it?" is the question which the ordinary lay reader, who is not a historian or an "authority," well may ask. The answer is, that these writers are still thinking, they persist in thinking, in terms of political personages and parties in power, or with a, to them, likely seeming chance of obtaining power—just as the historian of a former day was inclined to think of crowned heads and royal ministers as the makers of history, often ignoring entirely the great masses of the people and their enormous, if repressed, motive power—the revolutionary initiative and energy of the masses, as Lenin was fond of putting it—which every now and again would burst forth to amaze them, in the form of epoch-marking, world-changing upheavals.

A good case in point is afforded by Mr. Kirkpatrick himself, apropos of the Chilean People's Front. He closes his section on Chile (p. 194) with the following sentence:

> "An attempted left-wing 'popular front,' numerically strong if its component groups hold together or are allowed to do so (an unlikely event), indicates how far Chile has travelled from the aristocratic parliamentary oligarchy of former days."

This sentence, leaving aside the timid parenthesis, is true enough as far as it goes; but it is added at the end of the chapter, as a kind of afterthought—a single sentence to the already powerful People's Front of 1936! But history itself, fortunately, is not so timid as are most of those who write it; history, made by the masses, rises up to shame and gives the lie to those chroniclers whose bourgeois blinders prevent their seeing the great force that is the People. Two years later, and the Chilean People's Front has assumed power; the "unlikely event" has occurred!

It is this same blindness which accounts for the truly tragic failure made by Mr. Beals in his latest book, *The Coming Struggle for Latin America.** This it is which causes his book to bend in the middle, perform a contortionist's feat, with the second half

* *The Coming Struggle for Latin America*, by Carleton Beals, Lippincott, 1938.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

absolutely contradicting the first half, as well as the title and initial theme.* After portraying fascism as "at our doors in bloody earnest" (p. 159), he concludes, a couple of hundred pages later (p. 352), that "We will not be called upon to defend Latin America against Europe," thus playing directly into the hands of the Hoover-Wall Street "dollar diplomatists," aided and abetted by the Trotskyites and their ever-ready "line."

But how, it may be asked, could a self-respecting writer bring himself to perform so incredible a feat of self-contradiction and self-stultification? There must be, one would say, something to account for it; and there is. The explanation, once more, lies in the fact that Mr. Beals sees only regimes and existing governments—Vargas in Brazil, Benavides in Peru, etc. He does not see—does he want to see? —the *peoples,* the masses of workers and peasants, small business men, professionals and intellectuals, of certain Latin American countries, whose deep, upward surging will is being repressed and thwarted by the regimes in power. He does not realize that it is these masses who must save the Western Hemisphere from the fascist scourge, that they are the only ones who *can* save it. Instead, he joins in the Hoover-Trotskyite cry, that "the real enemy is not fascism, but Yankee imperialism," thereby rendering a very real service to the imperialists of Wall Street.**

And so with Mr. Kirkpatrick and the Brazilian uprising of 1935. The revolt was "not wholly, probably not mainly, communist." But what, then, was it?

> "Many joined the revolt weary of the irresponsible autocracy of successive presidents, unchecked by any parliamentary criticism, since the only opposition in Congress was a group of 'outs' wanting to get in and the only possible vote of censure was insurrection."*

Who were the "many"? Merely numerous scattered individuals, interested in certain democratic-parliamentary reforms? No, anyone who knows anything at all of conditions in Brazil should know that it went far deeper than this; he should know that the rebellion was rooted in the oppression and sufferings of the Brazilian masses,** due to foreign-imperialist exploitation, and was provoked by the rising menace of fascism, as reflected in Vargas' obvious vacillations between an Italian brand of fascism, a Nazism of the Brazilian variety, and an old-fashioned "strong man" military dictatorship. Had our author investigated the National Liberation Alliance, he might have found the situation clarified for him.

As it is, he is unable, for example, to grasp the significance of Luis Carlos Prestes' leadership, but alludes to ". . . the communist chief, Captain Prestes, said to be the author of the November revolt, a famous guerrillero and a legendary militant figure but no political guide." Now, Prestes is, indeed, a "legendary figure" in Brazil; but what is the nature of the

---

* A fact which practically all the reviewers, for some reason, let pass unnoticed. See review, however, by Gil Green in the December, 1938, COMMUNIST.

** We refer the reader to the thoroughgoing review of Beals' book by Gil Green in THE COMMUNIST for December, 1938.—*The Editors.*

* For this and the quotations on Brazil that follow, see Kirkpatrick, pp. 311-13.

** See Bryan Green's pamphlet, *Brazil,* International Publishers, 1935.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"legend," what lies behind it? It would be well to inquire into that. To the Brazilian masses, the toiling, exploited masses, Prestes is known as the "Knight of Hope," but neither Kirkpatrick nor Beals sees fit to mention this fact; if they were to mention it they might have to do some explaining of that word "hope."

If such historians are blind to the people and the people's ultimately determining strength, their vision is correspondingly distorted when it comes to the anti-popular and reactionary forces. While admitting that the 1935 uprising in the army barracks of Rio and Natal was "not wholly communist," or even mainly so, Mr. Kirkpatrick still fails to see, or will not see, the real reason for the red scare that was injected into the affair. Although he states that "'Agents from Moscow' were discerned in the most unlikely persons," he still feels that "the nervous alarm about communism was genuine." This is because he in effect refuses to recognize the existence of fascism—the word does not occur once in all the book—and along with it, that "anti-Comintern" technique of which fascism makes use, in its deadly intentioned assault upon all democracy and democratic forms. He speaks of the arrest of "unknown numbers, but certainly many thousands," and adds that "There is strong evidence of rough treatment (to use a mild term) of some prisoners." This surely is a "mild term," in view of the unspeakable tortures which are known to have been inflicted upon Prestes, his pregnant wife, and a host of other prisoners. Nor is any mention made of the fact that the "many thousands" included the cream of Brazil's intellectual, journalistic and political life, from senators down. From which it may be seen that an "academic caution" has its uses at times.

Of Getulio Vargas, the author, taking his customary refuge in quotation, in this case anonymous, has the following to say:

> "Vargas, described by a competent authority as 'broad-minded and progressive . . . a man of talent and vision,' a friend of social justice and of the working man, declared himself 'not unfavorable to the liberal idea.'"

For Mr. Kirkpatrick, as has been stated, is inclined to be impressed upon occasion by the Benavides idea of "dictatorially giving to the people what is good for them" (p. 223). The bloody tyrant of Santo Domingo, Trujillo, murderer of thousands of helpless, innocent Haitians, is "an excellent administrator and a hard worker" (p. 406). And dealing with the equally bloody Machado of Cuba, the author quotes with obvious approval L. H. Jenks,* who some years ago made the statement: "Machado and the group of brilliant young leaders who have his confidence have adhered with marked tenacity and intelligence to their programme of national revival." To which Mr. Kirkpatrick adds the revealing comment: "There is no inconsistency here: dictatorship often means reform" (p. 389).

"Reform," "national revival," "excellent administrator" (the trains on time again), "hard worker," etc.—how many times have we heard these phrases applied to Hitler and Mussolini by the paid or unpaid propagan-

* L. H. Jenks, *Our Cuban Colony*, New York, 1938.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dist, the tourist or the intellectual too ready to be impressed? Mr. Kirkpatrick's attitude, however, is not so facilely explained. The more we study it, the more we are convinced that it is due to a certain basic muddlement, which must be still further traced, which gives birth to a fear and distrust of the masses and of the democratic processes that represent them.

THE BOURGEOIS-DEMOCRATIC REVOLUTION AND AMERICAN WARS OF INDEPENDENCE

And now let us see what further light is to be had on those fundamental fallacies of approach which are responsible for the Latin American historian's failure to grasp the significance of many events and personages and the underlying forces, of the past nine years in particular (1930-39). We have seen that, at the root of it all, is his failure to perceive the determining play of class forces and the ultimately decisive role of the people, the masses—in short, the absence of a historical-materialist method. Lacking such a method, Mr. Kirkpatrick goes badly off almost at the beginning, as soon as he comes to treat of the results of the struggle for national independence on the part of the Latin American countries.

He does not appear to see that struggle as the first stage in the bourgeois-democratic revolution—of that revolution which is still in process today throughout the Latin American nations. That the forces of the bourgeois-democratic revolution did not immediately triumph, although they played the leading role in the fight for independence, should surprise no one. But around the interplay of these forces the whole history of the American nations is intertwined with the resultant "revolutions," and unstable governments. Only today, with the rise of a native bourgeoisie, of the working class and the further industrial development of the American states, are the forces developed which point to the fuller triumph of the bourgeois-democratic revolution. Speaking ing of the Peruvian "Revolution" (by which he means the War of Independence), he observes with some surprise (p. 73):

> "The Revolution was rather a completion than a reversal of the conquest, since it placed the conquered countries in the power of the Creole or semi-white descendants of Spanish conquerors and settlers."

Is there anything strange in this, one may ask, when it was the rising native-born Creole bourgeoisie which had fought the War of Independence? A Marxist, certainly, would see nothing strange in it. That the aboriginal Indian population should have found itself cheated of the fruits of victory is hardly surprising, when we recall the fate of the proletariat in the French (bourgeois-democratic) Revolution. To expect anything else is impatiently to attempt to pull the hands of history forward.

Mr. Kirkpatrick quotes with sadness certain disillusioned remarks by those great leaders, Bolívar and San Martín. For example, Bolívar on his death-bed:

> "I blush to say it, we have achieved nothing but independence at the cost of all other things."

But the doughty old warrior added:

> "Independence is a gate through which we may recover those things."

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

And Mr. Kirkpatrick is forced to admit: "This latter remark is not out of date today." The fighters for human freedom, even in the weariness of death, sometimes see further than do their chroniclers—of too little faith.

Upon the apparent basis of such statements as those of Bolívar, Mr. Kirkpatrick proceeds a little later to give us a rather doleful chapter entitled "Some Definitions," prefaced by the familiar Shakespearean line, "What's in a name?" (*i.e.*, what's in the name Democracy?).* In it, we read (pp. 126-27):

"The word 'Democracy,' constantly acclaimed by Latin American politicians, has a certain negative meaning, the absence of any recognized hereditary element in government, of titles, and (in theory at least) of permanent personal or oligarchical authority. But obviously, although representative forms exist, the word has not, in any practical or positive sense, its usual meaning."

To which is added the following from Lord Bryce:

"It is one of the oddest instances of the power of a word that the less educated and even many of the more educated persons among the free nations have continued, especially in the United States, to believe them [the Latin American nations] to be, because called 'Republics,' entitled to a confidence and sympathy which would not be given to a military tyranny under any other name."

These words, it must be said, have a familiar ring. From whom do we hear them today? From the intellectual spokesmen (whether they know it or not—like Mr. Beals) for that same Hoover-Wall Street gang of "dollar diplomatists," who, in the past, with their own imperialist interests only in view, have done all in their power to throttle the democratic strivings of the Latin American peoples. This sudden great concern for "true" democracy on the part of the bourgeois historian and political analyst, the North American journalist, and the representatives of Wall Street is, curiously enough, timed to serve as an opposition to the efforts of those who would unite the hemisphere against the menace of fascism, through an extension, in the form of President Roosevelt's Good Neighbor and hemisphere-defense programs, of the New Deal to the whole of the western world, thereby paving the way for a liberation of the peoples in question from their native tyrants and dictatorial regimes.

Comrade Earl Browder, with characteristic incisiveness and directness, cut through all this when, as the delegates were assembling for the Eighth Pan-American Conference in Lima, Peru, he said:

"We need have no illusion about the democratic character of many Latin American governments (including that of Peru itself); but even so a Pan-American front against the Munich powers and Japan is the first condition for raising Pan-American democracy to a higher and more effective level."*

Comrade Browder, as it happens, has history on his side. The method of historical analogies and parallels is a dangerous and even deadly one in the hands of the non-dialectical, who are inclined to view history as a repeating circle rather than, as Lenin

* *Latin America,* Chapter XIII.

* These words are appropriately cited by Comrades R. A. Martinez and Harry Robinson, in their article "Lima—An Answer to Munich," in the February, 1939, issue of *The Communist.*

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

puts it, a spiral, with the seeming "return" always on a higher plane. The view of history as a simple set of "parallels" and "analogies"—in other words, as essential repetition—leads to such fatal errors as those being made at the present moment by certain of our isolationists, pacifists and "anti-imperialists," who would make out the world situation of today to be a practical replica of that of 1914. And it is from a similar static conception of democracy, the most dynamic force in the modern world, that Mr. Kirkpatrick and other Latin American historians too frequently suffer.

Taking, then, the dialectic-dynamic view of history, if we go back to the latter half of the eighteenth century, we will find some interesting data to corroborate what Comrade Browder has to say concerning the relation of European forces and events to democracy in the Western Hemisphere. We will find that it was North America—the Thirteen Colonies—which gave the first impetus to Latin American independence, *by way of Europe.*

"A group of Brazilian youths studying in France and Portugal, hearing of the achievement of independence by the Thirteen British Colonies, became fired with revolutionary projects and French political theories."*

Incidentally, these were the same "French political theories" (an "alien ideology"!) which had inspired a Jefferson and a Paine, who, in turn, with their countrymen, were to become an inspiration for the French in the great Revolution of 1789, giving the French back their original theory enriched by American practice. Thus, even in those days, a century and a half ago, *there was no "isolation," there could not be,* but Europe, North America and Latin America were bound together in an indissoluble, inter-acting unity of ideas and revolutionary action; and Miranda, Bolívar, San Martín and the other South American heroes of the wars of independence went forth to do battle, with the *Declaration of the Rights of Man* and the *Declaration of Independence* alike ringing in their ears.

For our own Revolutionary War, the French Revolution, and the Latin American wars of national liberation, lasting down to about 1825, were, as the historical materialist knows, but diverse manifestations of the vast movement that was sweeping the occidental world: the bourgeois-democratic revolution. The British historian apparently does not appreciate the full significance of this, although the facts, which he himself relates, are staring him in the face.

Are we, then, to assume that the possibilities of isolation are greater today than they were in the eighteenth century, and that what happens to democracy in Europe makes no difference to democracy in Latin America? Are we to learn no lesson from the clearly seen relation between events in eighteenth-century Spain and the political trend of the Hispanic colonies in that era? As Mr. Kirkpatrick points out, the Napoleonic invasion of Spain, the setting up of a Spanish revolutionary-republican government, etc., had a very direct and tangible influence. Shall we not, accordingly, assume that the Franco victory will influence the further development of democracy in countries whose deepest, basic culture is still Iberic to the

* *Latin America,* p. 45.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

core? And shall we not agree with Comrade Browder that the best way to foster Pan-American democracy is by halting the march of world fascism, the embodiment of all anti-democratic forces?

But all this is foreign to a non-dialectical historian like Mr. Kirkpatrick, who cannot but lapse back into a defeatist attitude with respect to democracy. He quotes Professor Cleven's remark, made of Latin American nations generally:

"There is a class to which the government of the country belongs as of right. This right is regarded with a tenacity remarkable in the extreme."*

The class in question is the Creole feudal oligarchic cliques; but the historian hardly perceives how its "right" is being daily challenged more and more by the truly revolutionary upsurge of the suppressed native Indian population, belonging to the peasant class and the proletariat.

* * *

Such, then, is the Marxian "salt" which must be shaken over this work which is, all in all, the most convenient popular manual of Latin American history. The author, to repeat, has performed a small miracle of compression and orderly arrangement. Nor are Mr. Kirkpatrick's faults peculiar to him alone; they are the faults of Latin American historians in general. (Shall we say, of non-Marxian historians in general?) From which we Marxists can only conclude that the full, deep, inexhaustibly rich story of our neighbors to the south still remains to be told. It will be told some day, by the qualified Marxist-Leninist. In the meanwhile, the Latin American peoples are at this moment continuing to make history at an all but incredible rate of speed.

* *Latin America*, p. 127.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

FROM THE WORLD COMMUNIST PRESS

FROM "ON THE SITUATION AFTER HITLER'S WAR SPEECH OF APRIL 28, 1939"

Die Internationale, theoretical organ of the Communist Party of Germany, Nos. 5-6, 1939, Part VI. (Abridged translation.)

After the annexation of Czechoslovakia, Hitler sought to find still other justifications for the imperialist policy of Nazism than "Great Germany" and "the right of self-determination of the Germans." . . . For this reason Hitler, in his April 28 speech, developed in justification of the annexation of Czechoslovakia and the further robber plans of German imperialism *"arguments" to justify beforehand each new attack upon another people.* It is therefore necessary for the German anti-fascists to *introduce a systematic counter-propaganda against all these arguments.* At the present time the most important arguments of Nazi propaganda are the following:

a. Hitler justifies the conquest of Czechoslovakia and his further planned attacks against other peoples with so-called *historical arguments,* in which, twisting historical facts, he goes back to the time of the migrations of the "Holy Roman Empire," and other historic periods. Should this kind of argument, which has always belonged to the arsenal of the imperialists, become the guiding thread in relations between the peoples, *it would mean permanent war between the peoples.* For almost every people in Europe can argue that at one time or another in history it ruled over the present territory of other peoples. Thus, *e.g.,* France and Italy could make claims upon the territory of Germany with such arguments, and Germany could demand large districts of Italy (including Rome), and the Czechs and Poles likewise could demand important districts of Germany. . . . The attempt of German fascism to justify its imperialist policy of conquest by so-called historical arguments from the time when there were still no modern national states and no national consciousness, is therefore only *an attempt, in the interest of the German plutocracy, to make all* Europe a protectorate like Czechoslovakia. . . .

b. Hitler justified the conquest of Czechoslovakia and his further plans of conquest as *the reparation for the Versailles peace treaty and also for the non-application of Wilson's fourteen points.* Unquestionably the Versailles treaty was an imperialist crime against Germany. But the Versailles treaty is dead and the Hitler regime has enforced against Austria and Czechoslovakia *diktats* a hundred times worse than that which was enforced against Germany at the time of the Versailles treaty. What the peoples want today is not a Versailles *diktat* against Germany, but peace

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and the prevention of the rule of Hitler fascism over other peoples. Hence the attempt of the Hitler regime, in the name of the dead Versailles treaty, *to enforce a fascist "Versailles" over the world,* can only unleash a European war against the strongest peoples of the world, which would necessarily end in another frightful defeat for Germany. Such a policy adventurously places the fate of the German nation at stake. . . .

The Nazi dictatorship conducts an unremitting campaign of incitement and an unending struggle against the Soviet Union, the only great power which from the very beginning took a stand against the policy of conquests and against the Versailles treaty, while the Hitler dictatorship on the contrary has the closest friendship with Mussolini and the Japanese militarists, who were the most deceitful instigators of war against Germany and adherents of the Versailles treaty. The Hitler dictatorship conducts the sharpest struggle against the progressive forces in other countries, which were the opponents of the Versailles treaty and which tomorrow as well, in the event of another defeat of Germany, will be the truest friends of the German people and the sternest adversaries of any attempt of the imperialists of other countries to act against Germany with intentions of conquest.

c. Hitler further seeks to justify the annexation of Czechoslovakia and his further plans of conquest by the *"necessity" of a German lebensraum [living space], by Germany's being a poor country.* But Germany is not a poor country, but *belongs among the richest countries of the world.* If the German people are transformed to an entirely special extent into have-nots under the Hitler regime, this is precisely the work of the plutocracy, the big armament trusts, the reactionary big capitalists, whose agency the Hitler regime is. . . . They are preventing the colossal productive forces of Germany, the industry and skill of the German workers and peasants, from being used to make Germany a flourishing and rich land for everyone.

It is not other nations which make Germany poor; it is not campaigns of conquest against other people which will make the German people rich. *In order that the German people, today a people of have-nots, shall become rich and happy, it must throw off its plutocracy and the Nazi dictatorship, which today have made Germany only a "living space" for the rich, for the reactionary capitalists and the corrupt Nazi bureaucrats.* . . .

d. Hitler shouted in his speech against the *"war incitment of the plutocrats in the other countries"* and *"the policy of encirclement of Germany."* Undoubtedly there is also a brutal plutocracy in the capitalist, non-fascist countries. But it is precisely this plutocracy which is most friendly to the Hitler policy of repression of the working class and the peasantry and enmity against the Soviet Union. It is this plutocracy which by their "non-intervention" gave Hitler and Mussolini power in Spain. And if Hitler were such an enemy of plutocracy, why then does he employ such fierce incitement against Bolshevism and against the Soviet Union, where plutocracy has been uprooted and real socialism established? Why does Hitler wage such an embittered strug-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

gle against democracy, in which the workers, in the possession of political rights, can lead the struggle against their plutocracy?

And in what country does the plutocracy rule more brutally and ruthlessly than in Germany? In what country is the state power such a brutal executive organ of the great trusts as under the fascist dictatorship in Germany? In what country are the working people so robbed of all rights, in the interests of the great trusts, as under the Nazi dictatorship in Germany? The American, French and English plutocrats are no doubt cut from the same cloth as the German, but in France, England and the United States, the workers and toiling people have found in the democratic liberties and the right of organization a method of waging the struggle against these reactionary forces. . . .

e. Hitler justifies the annexation of Czechoslovakia and his further plans of conquest by the statement *that England, France and other nations have also conquered colonies and established colonial empires by force,* and that it would be shameful for Germany if it did not receive back the former German colonies. In all the colonial and semi-colonial peoples, as shown most obviously by China, the will to win independence from the imperialist yoke has grown strongly, and *every right and progressive-thinking man will unreservedly support the struggle of the colonial peoples for their national freedom against all imperialisms and all plutocracies.* But the Hitler regime is not fighting for the freedom of the colonial peoples, but for a still sharper robbing of these colonial peoples by the German plutocracy. It is not to the dishonor of the German people that it has no colonies; it is, however, to the dishonor of the German people that it permitted the Nazi dictatorship to make colonial peoples of the Austrians, who are as little Germans as are the Swiss, and of the Czechoslovakian people, peoples with a thousand years' history; that it permitted the Nazi dictatorship to treat twenty million Austrians, Slovaks and Czechs as colonial slaves.

The conquest of colonies and their robbery by the German plutocracy would not make a single German more prosperous; it would only open new sources of profit for the handful of German profiteers and the Nazi bureaucrats, and give them new military bases for the fortification of which the German people will have to pay still more taxes. . . .

f. Hitler sought furthermore to justify his policy by the statement that it has taken place *without "the spilling of blood,"* and Nazi propaganda strives, utilizing the policy of the reactionary forces in England and France, to confuse the people with the phrase, *"Hitler can do everything."* There is nothing more dangerous for the German people than to fall victim to this phrase. It is not true that the policy of Hitler and the Italian and Japanese militarists with whom he is allied has taken place without the spilling of blood. How much blood has already been spilled by Hitler, Mussolini and the Japanese militarists in Spain, China, Ethiopia and Albania! How many Austrian and Czech patriots have already been murdered by the Gestapo? How many

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

upright German, Italian and Japanese anti-fascists have been killed because they opposed the adventurist policy of their fascist governments?

Can a German really imagine that the *Soviet Union* will permit itself to be disarmed? Can a reasonable German really believe that the United States will permit itself to be disarmed by the war axis? Can a reasonable German in any way believe that France and England, despite all their reactionary bourgeois forces, will permit themselves to be disarmed by Hitler and Mussolini? . . . *Hitler cannot do everything, but he is doing everything to drive the German people into a frightful, hopeless war of conquest.*

The easy "masterly" successes of Hitler fascism until now were extremely costly successes. What was squeezed out of the German people for armaments for the conquest policy was more than four times the value of the conquered lands. The German economy is falling into ever greater chaos and is developing in an ever more rapid tempo the signs of a frightful crisis, as a result of the armament policy of the Nazi dictatorship. *The German working people are being squeezed more tightly than ever before in the modern history of Germany.* Poverty and shortages are growing at giant strides. That is only the first result of Hitler's "successes." *Hitler cannot do everything, but actually he is doing everything to bleed the German nation white in the interest of the conquest politicians.*

g. In his speech Hitler strove to convince the German people that *"the entire world hates Germany and wants to destroy Germany."* That is not true. What the entire world does hate, and with the same right as the German people itself, is the *Hitler dictatorship.* The German people is not isolated and has strong allies. The Austrian and German peoples, who are the mortal foes of the Nazi oppressors, love those Germans who in the darkest hours in the lives of these peoples fought with them against the common oppressor and support them in their struggle for their independence. *The German people have the most powerful ally in the Soviet Union, whose friendship has always been proven since the existence of the Soviet Union in the darkest hours of the German people, and will be proven again in the future.* In the working class, in all progressive and freedom-loving sections of other peoples, which are always waging a hard struggle against their own reactionary bourgeoisie, the German people have strong allies. All these allies do not wish to destroy Germany, but they want peace, they want to defend themselves against the attacks of the Hitler dictatorship, and just like us Germans, they want to see the world freed from the Nazi plague and reaction as such.

Every action of the Hitler regime against other peoples strengthens the hatred against the Nazi dictatorship and increases the danger that backward sections of other peoples will confuse the German people with Hitler. Every sign, every action of the German people against Hitler, against his policy of oppression of other peoples, against his policy of conquests, strengthens the friendship, the respect, the bond of other peoples with the German people. The German

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

revolution against Hitler, which will free Germany and the world from the Nazi war-instigators, would be the most beloved revolution among all peoples of the earth. The German people, in freeing themselves from Hitler, even before he begins war, would become the most respected and beloved people in the world. A Germany freed of Hitler would be given powerful support by the other peoples against all attempts of reactionary imperialist forces to weaken and attack the new, free Germany.

The *people's revolution against Hitler* will ally Germany with all peoples upon the plane of equality and respect; the *Nazi dictatorship* on the other hand makes the German people hated and involves it in war with the strongest peoples in the world. From this follows that the German people, in the interest of the saving of the German nation, must develop its struggle against the Hitler dictatorship in more rapid tempo than hitherto, that it must not fear sacrifices in this struggle, which are small in comparison with the frightful sacrifices which th
ler dictatorshi
by Hitler bri
ple. For, eve
peace front is fo
ance of the reactionary fo
other countries is overcome, *tha
alone cannot prevent war and overthrow Hitler*. This peace front can only ease the conditions of the struggle of the German people, and will facilitate them greatly, *but the Hitler dictatorship must be overthrown by the German people itself,* no matter what the tempo in which the development of the international peace front is completed.

Hence the greatest responsibility lies upon the shoulders of the German people itself in the international struggle for the overthrow of Hitler fasicism, and hence the Berne conference of the Communist Party of Germany characterized *the overthrow of the war-instigator, Hitler, as the highest national task of all Germans, and hence the German people's revolution will be the greatest national accomplishment of the Germans.*

The article on Psychoanalysis, in the series on Current Trends in Psychology, by R. L. Gley, which was announced for this issue, will appear in an early number of The Communist.—THE EDITORS.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BOOK REVIEWS

PSYCHOANALYZING THE JEWS

MOSES AND MONOTHEISM, by Sigmund Freud. New York, Alfred A. Knopf. 218 pp. $3.00.

THE doctrines of Sigmund Freud, developed over a span of more than forty years, have had a deep influence on many persons in the fields of psychiatry, social service, education, literature and art, and through them on many others. Many people who wish to be in the forefront of social progress have taken them to be a scientific explanation of individual behavior and a key to mental disturbances. When Freud now at the climax of his career applies his matured conceptions to a book-length study of the characteristics of the Jewish people and of anti-Semitism, it is necessary to make a serious appraisal of the book and the doctrines it exemplifies.

A sound psychology should accord with a sound theory of history to give a valuable insight into the development of cultures, religions and the relationships of peoples. It is not too much to ask that it should enrich our understanding of the political practice whose aim is to change the world by removing the roots of such phenomena as chauvinism and releasing the creative powers of mankind for their fullest development. What, then, is the contribution of Freud to the great problem to which he applies himself in this book?

Freud's historical account does not go beyond the dawn of Christianity. But his references to anti-Semitism of today, to the Nazis, "the new enemy," and to his own persecution as a Jew make it clear that, in accordance with Freudian practice in explaining individual histories, he considers all the essentials of the problem to have become established at that early stage.

His method is not that of objective history. He tells us that he had selected and rejected from the historical record and from anthropological theories in accordance with psychoanalytic theory. That theory, with respect to religion, was laid down more than a quarter of a century ago in his *Totem and Taboo* (1912). He expresses it in the present book in these words:

"From then on I have never doubted that religious phenomena are to be understood only on the model of the neurotic symptoms of the individual, which are so familiar to us, as a return of long-forgotten important happenings in the primeval history of the human family, that they owe their obsessive character to that very origin and therefore derive their effect on mankind from the historical truth they contain." (P. 89.)

It is on this basis that he picks from various sources the cues for a reconstruction which can be summarized thus:

Freud ascribes to Moses the authorship and responsibility of all the achievements and all the sufferings of the Jews from the escape from bondage to this day. He presents his reasons for assuming that Moses was not a Jew, but a high-born Egyptian, who continued the tradition of monotheism which for a brief period was imposed on Egypt by the ill-fated young King Ikhnaton, who reigned from 1375 to 1358 B.C. Despairing of winning Egypt back to the new and higher religion, Moses chose the Children of Israel for his people and led them out of Egypt with the idea of building up a new and more powerful people under his authority. In the desert, the Children of Israel revolted against the strict rule of Moses, killed him, and reverted to paganism. Later they regretted the murder of their great leader, and drove it from their memory, but it survived as a dark feeling of guilt in the "racial unconscious," and in Palestine it eventually emerged again in the reinstitution of Mosaic law and monotheism, but in a new form, with Jehovah in the image of the stern, angry, but fatherly

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Moses, and connected with the prediction of his eventual return as Messiah.

To explain the unconquerable force of this reinstatement, Freud appeals (as he did in *Totem and Taboo*) to the hypothesis of certain anthropologists that in prehistoric times the human horde was dominated by one powerful, jealous polygamous male who subdued, castrated or drove out his sons until a time when the sons managed to unite against their father, killed him, and entered into a "social contract" to live together in mutual tolerance. This theory was long ago disposed of in *The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State*, by Engels, who pointed out that not even the most primitive human horde could have subsisted except as a social unit of which the mutual tolerance of the grown males was a necessary condition.

For Freud this prehistoric patricide is the "original sin" (p. 214) the guilt of which has lurked darkly in the "unconscious memory" of the whole human race, exerting its compulsive influence on all of human history, repeating itself in the murder of Moses and by reaction causing the eventual restitution of Mosaic religion.

The same pattern recurs in the Christ-story, but this time it is a Son who expiates with his life the immemorial patricides of generations of sons. It is to the relief of this expiation from "unconscious guilt" that he ascribes the power of the Christian religion.

"The poor Jewish people, who with its usual stiff-necked obduracy continued to deny the murder of their 'father,' has dearly expiated this in the course of centuries. Over and over again they heard the reproach: 'You killed our God.' And this reproach is true, if rightly interpreted. . . . Something should be added—namely: 'It is true, we did the same thing, but we *admitted* it, and since then we have been purified.' Not all accusations with which anti-Semitism pursues the descendants of the Jewish people are based on such good foundations. There must, of course, be more than one reason for a phenomenon of such intensity and lasting strength as the popular hatred of the Jews. . . . Other grounds for anti-Semitism are stronger, as, for example, the circumstance that Jews mostly live as a minority among other peoples, since the feeling of solidarity of the masses, in order to be complete, has need of an animosity against an outside minority. . . .

"The deeper motives of anti-Semitism have their roots in times long past; they come from the unconscious. . . . I venture to assert that the jealousy which the Jews evoked in other peoples by maintaining that they were the first-born, favorite child of God the Father has not yet been overcome. . . . Then there is lastly the most recent motive of the series. We must not forget that all the peoples who now excel in the practice of anti-Semitism became Christians only in relatively recent times, sometimes forced to it by bloody compulsion. One might say they all are 'badly Christened'; under the thin veneer of Christianity they have remained what their ancestors were, barbarically polytheistic. . . . The hatred for Judaism is at bottom hatred for Christianity, and it is not surprising that in the German National-Socialist revolution this close connection of the two monotheistic religions finds such clear expression in the hostile treatment of both." (Pp. 142-5.)

The passage above is considerably shortened for reasons of space, but Freud's explanation of anti-Semitism would not be changed substantially by full quotation of all the points he makes.

* * *

These are Freud's thesis and conclusions. We can fairly sum them up to this:

Anti-Semitism is a regrettable but inevitable popular phenomenon, rooted in the "deep unconscious" of mankind. We must not be surprised to find that Freud offers no hint of a possible solution. It follows inevitably from his presentation that there is none.

It would be hard to find a more reactionary explanation outside the official "theories" of Hitlerism, though Freud says of this "new enemy"—"I shall guard against doing anything that would serve his interests."

Just as Freud and his followers have uncritically accepted so many appearances for truth (as, for instance, the "innate, independent, instinctual disposition to aggression" of psychoanalytic theory) so, against the whole evidence of history, he starts with the wildly false assumption that anti-Semitism is constant, popular and universal. Not once does he feel the need to enquire under what historic conditions anti-Semitism arises, how it is fomented, by whom, or to what ends. The obvious parallels of anti-Negroism, anti-Catholicism, and many another form of national or religious antagonism to

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which class discontent is diverted in times of crisis, for which at least he would need a different story, are ignored. The final disappearance of anti-Semitism along with chauvinism of every kind in the Soviet Union is, forsooth, beyond Freud's concern as a psychologist, though he could not refrain from a stupid and ignorant gibe about "coercion" in the U.S.S.R. in the present book.

The practical conclusion to be drawn from his labors can only be a hopeless passivity toward persecutions as unfortunate natural expressions of "human nature," and a capitulation to the cowardly "appeasement" policy which seeks to suppress the defense of popular rights as the only answer to their violation.

And, indeed, who but the fascists and their apologists can benefit from Freud's utterly false theory that the masses have need of an animosity against an outside minority (quoted above)? Or from this:

"The great majority of people have a strong need for authority which they can admire, to which they can submit, and which dominates and sometimes ill-treats them. We have learned from the psychology of the individual whence comes this need of the masses. It is the longing for the father." (P. 172.)

The revolting Nazi doctrines of "blood purge" find strange rationalization in well-developed chapters of which the following is representative with respect to murder:

"The founding of the Mohammedan religion seems to me to be an abbreviated repetition of the Jewish one, in imitation of which it made its appearance. . . . The regaining of the one great primeval Father produced in the Arabs an extraordinary advance in self-confidence which led them to great worldly successes, but which, it is true, exhausted itself in these. . . . The inner development of the new religion, however, soon came to a standstill, perhaps because it lacked the profundity which in the Jewish religion resulted from the murder of its founder." (P. 146.)

The objective history of the Jews and of Christendom through which the Jews were scattered as strangers after the Diaspora gives the clearest direction to Marxists for a scientific understanding of the factors which developed and sustained the specific characteristics of the Jewish people, and of the forces which at specific times and places used the peculiar position of the Jews to foment anti-Jewish chauvinism as a diversion of the masses from their real enemies. A valuable first attempt at a part of this task was made in *Foundations of Christianity,* written by Karl Kautsky when he was still a Marxist.

It is because we know the objective history of anti-Semitism and know how fascist demagogy foments it and socialism destroys its roots that we know how it can be banished from the earth just as the Soviet Union has already banished it within its borders.

This review cannot, of course, undertake a general evaluation of Freudism or its actual clinical results. But Freud's present book illustrates on the grand scale of history the fatal error of explaining basic human motivations subjectively, in terms of conscious or unconscious forces disconnected from actual objective social conditions and relations. The result is an "explanation" which leaves man powerless to transform the condition which has been "explained."

Freud with his "human nature" approach, which in the realm of history is idealist and not materialist, has never understood or accepted the essentially social nature of man, the fact that every individual is an organic part of a concrete, historically evolving society; social forces are wholly secondary with him. Behind the human behavior and its changes which he observed he could only imagine dark, irrational pre-formed "instincts" unfolding "with monotonous regularity."

The historical materialist understanding of anti-Semitism is infinitely deeper and richer than Freud's miserably impotent, pseudo-materialist one; above all it is powerful, it proves itself in practice to be correct. The Marxists see the ideas in the minds of masses and individuals as the historically developed products of specific social relations, which can be understood, and which can be transformed. It therefore follows that the solution of the problems of masses and of individuals lies in the correct understanding of their true social relationships, an understanding which is inseparable from action.

MORRIS COLMAN

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

TOWARD MISUNDERSTANDING THE U.S.S.R.

TOWARD AN UNDERSTANDING OF THE U.S.S.R., by Michael T. Florinsky, New York, The Macmillan Company, 1939, 245 pp.

BORN and raised in the Russia of the tsars, later an officer in the White armies and now a teacher of economics at Columbia University, the author of this book is most definitely no friend of the Soviet Union. For several years he has been amply demonstrating his feeling on this and kindred subjects by publishing in the Sunday Book Review Section of *The New York Times* most unfair reviews, not only of books dealing with the U.S.S.R., but of all anti-fascist works. He now presents us with an entire volume on the Soviet Union, which, according to the preface, is but a part of a larger study edited by Professor James Shotwell, to appear in 1940.

One would not expect that Florinsky could produce anything reasonably fair on the Soviet Union. However, this time he took a definite step "forward"; the book is not only anti-Soviet, as anticipated, but it is also permeated with a consistent feeling of despair and frustration, a distinct innovation in red-baiting literature.

The problem of the withering away of the state seems particularly to bother Florinsky; he comes back to it again and again. Quotations from Lenin and Stalin are twisted and turned, as the anger of the author rises because the U.S.S.R. advances instead of withering away.

Abundant crocodile tears are shed over "the decline of Marxism" in the Soviet Union. Here the former White Guard follows the Trotsky line to the dot. To him the new *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks)* is just a "bitter indictment of the Russian revolutionary movement." However, these antics are not the most amusing part of this opus.

The funniest sections of this systematized effort to misunderstand and misinterpret the Soviet Union are the repeated confessions of the author as to his failure to comprehend things. First a description of some phase of the development of the U.S.S.R. is given, occasionally even quite well done, then the conclusion is drawn that either it does not mean anything or it is so hard to arrive at what it could mean that the author just gives up guessing.

This peculiar process is repeated over and over. Florinsky cannot understand, for instance, the role of the monopoly of foreign trade, the necessity for a turnover tax, why planning allows the overfulfillment of plans, and why the Soviets were in such a hurry to industrialize the country. Wherever the author omits to say that something is quite good because, to his way of thinking, a similar development has taken place in Nazi Germany, the I-do-not-understand method of refutation is used after quotation of figures, which should have easily enlightened the author, if he were at all open to such a process on matters relating to the Soviet Union.

The book ends with an all-embracing cry of despair. The Soviet regime is, to the author, just a continuation of a curse that began as early as the twelfth century. What such an ending is supposed to mean is wisely left unexplained; in all probability the learned doctor of economics has not the slightest idea as to its meaning, he just feels that way.

If this book is to be used by any reasonable person, it is the advice of the reviewer to use it as one of the best samples of how one can write and not say anything, of how one can study and not learn, of how one can quote and refuse to understand. But apparently even to a Florinsky the facts of the progress of the U.S.S.R. are hard to twist out of the picture altogether; hence, the deliberate refusal to comprehend the obvious, the futilitarian mood throughout the volume and the cry of despair at the end.

SETH LARSON

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LATEST BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS RECEIVED

FIGHTING FOR PEACE, *by Earl Browder,* International Publishers, New York, 50c.

YOUR QUESTIONS ANSWERED, *by William Z. Foster,* Workers Library Publishers, New York, 15c.

THE SOVIET UNION AND THE PEACE FRONT, *by V. M. Molotov,* International Publishers, New York, 3c.

THE WORLD COMMUNIST MOVEMENT, *by D. Z. Manuilsky,* Workers Library Publishers, New York, 10c.

THE SOVIET UNION IN 1942, *by V. M. Molotov,* Workers Library Publishers, New York, 15c.

THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE SOVIET UNION, *by A. A. Zhdanov,* Workers Library Publishers, New York, 15c.

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE YOUNG COMMUNIST LEAGUE OF THE U.S.A., New Age Publishers, New York, 3c.

THE REAL FATHER COUGHLIN, *by A. B. Magil,* Workers Library Publishers, New York, 5c.

SOLUTION FOR PALESTINE. THE CHAMBERLAIN WHITE PAPER, *by Paul Novick,* National Council of Jewish Communists, New York, 5c.

CHARACTER BUILDING AND EDUCATION IN THE SPIRIT OF SOCIALISM, *by Henry Winston,* New Age Publishers, New York, 5c.

AIR WAR, *by W. O'D. Pierce,* Modern Age Books, New York, 50c.

WHAT MAKES CRIME? *by Winthrop D. Lane,* Public Affairs Committee, New York, 10c.

THE JOCKEY AND THE HORSE, *by Alderman Stewart Smith,* New Era Publishers, Toronto, 3c.

NEGRO SLAVE REVOLTS IN THE UNITED STATES, 1526-1860, *by Herbert Aptheker,* International Publishers, New York, 15c.

SONGS FOR AMERICA, Workers Library Publishers, New York, 25c.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LEADERSHIP IN THE NEWS

Earl Browder says—

"One of the primary obligations of every Communist Party member is that he keep himself thoroughly informed of every change in the world situation. He can not keep himself so informed, nor can he truly understand the role of the Communist Party, unless he reads the Daily Worker *every day*."

William Z. Foster says—

"We have many friends who look to our Party for leadership and guidance. But they will never reap the full benefit of this close association, never fully understand us, unless they also look to the Party's official organ, the Daily Worker, for leadership in the news. The Daily Worker is the only English newspaper in the East which shows our Party as it is in action—our Party in the news!"

CLIP *SUBSCRIBE TODAY* MAIL

RATES

(Except Manhattan, Bronx, Canada and Foreign)

	3 mos.	*6 mos.*	*1 year*
DAILY WORKER	$2.00	$3.50	$6.00
DAILY AND SUNDAY WORKER	$2.50	$4.50	$8.00
SUNDAY WORKER	$ .75	$1.25	$2.00

Vacation Rate . . . 25 cents per week

Send me the ☐ Daily Worker ☐ Daily and Sunday Worker ☐ Sunday Worker for . . . . . months. I am enclosing $ . . . . . .

Name . . . . . .

Address . . . . . .

City . . . . . State . . . . . .

Date (for vacation subscription) . . . . . .

MAIL *NOW* TO THE

DAILY WORKER

50 East 13th Street, New York City

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A BOOK OF WORLD IMPORTANCE!

History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union

Prepared under the supervision of the Central Committee, C.P.S.U.

"The study of the heroic history of the Bolshevik Party arms us with the knowledge of the laws of social development and political struggle, with the knowledge of the driving forces of the revolution.

"The study of the history of the C.P.S.U. strengthens our confidence in the final victory of the great cause of the Party of Lenin and Stalin, the victory of Communism throughout the entire world."

From Introduction to **History of the C.P.S.U.**

"WITH THIS BOOK WE WILL RAISE UP A WHOLE GENERATION SCHOOLED IN THE BEST THOUGHT PRODUCED BY HUMANITY."

Earl Browder, **Theory as a Guide to Action**

364 Pages. Cloth $1.00

●

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Station D, New York, N. Y.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED